BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dissertation

# THE VIEW OF MAN AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN THE THOUGHT OF HARRISON SACKET ELLIOTT AND OF LEWIS JOSEPH SHERRILL

by

Charles Chiau-Liong Kao

(Diploma, Tainan Theological College, 1955
Westminster College, Cambridge, 1961;
S.T.M., Union Theological Seminary, 1962)

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
1969

APPROVED

by

First Reader Walter L. Holcomb
Professor of Religious Education

Second Reader Wm. Clifton Moore
Professor of Religious Education

# THE VIEW OF MAN AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN THE THOUGHT OF HARRISON SACKET ELLIOTT AND OF LEWIS JOSEPH SHERRILL

(Order No. ____________)

Charles Chiau-Liong Kao, Ph.D.
Boston University Graduate School, 1969

Major Professor: Walter L. Holcomb, Professor of
Religious Education

The problem of the dissertation is to determine the basic principles which are inherent in the relationship between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education held by Elliott and by Sherrill.

The method of the dissertation is largely that of library research. The research follows three steps. The first step is to determine Elliott's and Sherrill's views of man and their philosophies of Christian education. The second step is to analyze the relationship between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education in each person's thought. The third step is to compare Elliott and Sherrill in terms of their views of man, their philosophies of Christian education, and the relationship between the two.

The findings of the dissertation are summarized as follows:

1. Elliott's thinking is wholistic and naturalistic. He emphasizes human potentialities, the amorality and neutrality of man's original nature, man's needs for security,

acceptance and achievement, and the plasticity of human personality. He understands sin in concrete terms. In his philosophy of Christian education, Elliott emphasizes the group thinking process, the life-situation-centered approach, the reinterpretation and enrichment of the Christian faith by individuals and groups for themselves, and the realization of a co-operative society in which love is genuinely operative. He sees that man learns in and through human experience.

2. Sherrill's thinking is wholistic, naturalistic and supernaturalistic. He emphasizes man's being created in the image of God, the existence of the "demonic element" in man, man's needs to become an individual and to identify with something greater and stronger than oneself, and the dynamic nature of the human self. He interprets sin as the breakdown of relationships. In his philosophy of Christian education, he emphasizes two-way communication and non-verbal communication, the "koinonia" of the Christian community, and the changes of relationships which reflect man's various dimensions of being. He sees that man learns in and through relationships.

3. Both Elliott and Sherrill have coherently related their views of man and their philosophies of Christian education. Elliott's thought system is anthropocentric and mono-polar, whereas Sherrill's is theo-anthropocentric and bi-polar.

The conclusions of the dissertation are summarized as follows:

1. In the thought system of one who coherently relates his view of man and his philosophy of Christian education, there is a core, regardless of whether the core is mono-polar or bi-polar.

2. The dynamic view of man leads to relativistic and pluralistic thinking. Thus, it is impossible to have a universally accepted philosophy of Christian education.

3. A naturalistic view of man leads to a naturalistic philosophy of Christian education. Likewise, a naturalistic and supernaturalistic view of man leads to a naturalstic and supernaturalistic philosophy of Christian education.

4. Conceptually one may be naturalistic or naturalistic and supernaturalistic, but in practice one tends to be anthropocentric.

The implications of the dissertation are summarized as follows:

1. It is imperative for those who want to integrate their views of man and their philosophies of Christian education to determine the core of their thought system and select a key concept in relating the two.

2. For the philosophy of Christian education which is adequate and relevant in a highly pluralistic and dynamic society, a dynamic view of man is needed.

3. A dynamic view of man would lead the church not to

enforce any particular philosophy of Christian education to be accepted unquestionably.

4. Any change in the theological view of man needs to be taken into serious considerations by Christian educators.

5. The study of man is highly important because one tends to be anthropocentric in practice even though he claims to be theo-anthropocentric in theory.

A further study of similar kind would be desirable.

# PREFACE

The writer would like to express his gratitude and appreciation to his first reader, Dr. Walter L. Holcomb, and his second reader, Dr. Wm. Clifton Moore, for their guidance in research and dissertation writing.

To Dr. Donald M. Maynard, Professor of Religious Education, Emeritus, and his wife, he expresses his sincere thankfulness for their friendship and loving care which brought him to Boston.

To the Board of World Missions of The Reformed Church in America, he is grateful for its scholarship which has enabled him to complete his doctoral study.

To Dean Walter G. Muelder, Dr. S. Paul Schilling and other faculty members, he expresses his appreciation for their noble personhood and religious convictions which he has found to be of sustaining value during his study at Boston.

Finally, the writer's appreciation is extended to his wife and son who have endured a long term family separation during his study.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem of the Dissertation . . . . . 1
2. The Significance of the Dissertation . . . 2
3. Definitions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4
4. Limitations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 5
5. Previous Research Related to the Dissertation . . . . . . . . . . . . . 8
6. The Method and Organization of the Dissertation . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11

II. BIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION

1. Harrison S. Elliott . . . . . . . . . . . . 14
2. Lewis J. Sherrill . . . . . . . . . . . . . 22

III. ELLIOTT'S VIEW OF MAN

1. Man in God's Creation . . . . . . . . . . . 34
2. Sin and Man's Original Nature . . . . . . . 40
3. Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth . . . . 50
4. Human Knowledge . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 63

IV. ELLIOTT'S PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

1. Freedom and Authority . . . . . . . . . . . 70
2. Objectives of Christian Education . . . . . 80
3. Content of Christian Education . . . . . . 89
4. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory . . . 95

V. SHERRILL'S VIEW OF MAN

1. Man in God's Creation . . . . . . . . . . . . 111

2. Sin and Man's Original Nature . . . . . . . . 114

3. Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth . . . . 123

4. Human Knowledge . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 134

VI. SHERRILL'S PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

1. Freedom and Authority . . . . . . . . . . . 141

2. Objectives of Christian Education . . . . . . 151

3. Content of Christian Education . . . . . . 156

4. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory . . . 162

VII. AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ELLIOTT'S VIEW OF MAN AND HIS PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

1. The Nature of Man in Relation to Freedom and Authority in Christian Education . . 180

2. The Nature of Man in Relation to the Objectives of Christian Education . . . . 188

3. The Nature of Man in Relation to the Content of Christian Education . . . . . 195

4. The Nature of Man in Relation to Teaching Methods and Learning Theory . . 201

VIII. AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHERRILL'S VIEW OF MAN AND HIS PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

1. The Nature of Man in Relation to Freedom and Authority in Christian Education . . 208

2. The Nature of Man in Relation to the Objectives of Christian Education . . . . 215

3. The Nature of Man in Relation to the Content of Christian Education . . . . . 222

4. The Nature of Man in Relation to Teaching Methods and Learning Theory . . 229

IX. A COMPARISON OF ELLIOTT AND SHERRILL

1. The Nature of Man . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 239

2. Philosophy of Christian Education . . . . . . 246

3. The Relationship between One's View of Man and His Philosophy of Christian Education 253

X. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

1. Findings . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 262

2. Conclusions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 267

3. Implications . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 269

APPENDIX I . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 271

APPENDIX II . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 272

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 273

VITA . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 285

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

## 1. The Problem of the Dissertation

The problem of the dissertation is to determine the basic principles which are inherent in the relationship between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education held by Harrison Sacket Elliott and by Lewis Joseph Sherrill. The questions to be asked in this dissertation are; 1) What are the views of these two leaders in the field of Christian education with regard to man in God's creation, sin and man's original nature, man's basic needs and human growth, and human knowledge? 2) What are their views of Christian education with regard to the major issues, such as freedom and authority, the objectives and content of Christian education, teaching methods and learning theory? 3) How are their views of man related to their philosophies of Christian education?

The choice of the problem is based on the writer's long range planning which attempts not only to bring together the Christian faith and education but to find harmonious unification, synthesis, and integration of the two. It is his conviction that real unity and integrity are the signs of maturity for the individual, and the whole of mankind.

On the contrary, divisiveness and disintegration are marks of immaturity at all levels. It seems that Elliott and Sherrill have made considerable effort to work out a real integration of the Christian faith and education from different positions. The task of working out an integration of the two is very important, as Paul H. Vieth succinctly states it, "There are two elements in religious education—religion and education which must be held in inseparable relationship."[1] The problem is chosen by the writer of this dissertation because the issue of the nature of man and Christian education is one of the major concerns of Christian educators.[2]

## 2. The Significance of the Dissertation

The dissertation is significant because it provides a source of reference for those who are in the process of formulating their philosophy of Christian education. From

---

1. Paul H. Vieth, "Religious Education Faces the Future," Religious Education, Vol. LIX (May-June, 1964), p. 209.

   Also see, Gordon D. Kaufman, "Christian Education without Theological Foundation," Religious Education, Vol. LX (January-February, 1965), p. 15.

   George M. Schreyer, Christian Education in Theological Focus, (Philadelphia: The Christian Education Press, 1962), p. 197.

2. William Clifton Moore, "Christian Education in the Light of Three Theological Views of Man," (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Boston University, 1954), p. 2.

this study, one would not only find Elliott's and Sherrill's views of man and philosophies of Christian education as helpful resources--content materials, but also obtain helpful insights as to what steps should be taken in relating one's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education--its methodology.

As Lawrence C. Little points out, "one of the most crucial needs of the church today is a more adequate philosophy of Christian education."[1] In meeting this crucial need, the church would find some guiding lines from the dissertation in defining the adequate and relevant philosophy of Christian education in the light of the rapid social change caused by modern science and technology.

In recent years, the theological tide has been changing from the so-called "neo-orthodox" to a more liberal "secularized theology." This change seems to be analogous to that which moves from the theological position of Sherrill to Elliott's position. This study may throw light on the integration of the sacred and the secular and on the understanding of the direction toward which the church should move in its educational thinking along with the change in its theological thinking.

---

1. Lawrence C. Little, Foundations for a Philosophy of Christian Education, (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 1.

## 3. Definitions

In this dissertation, the term "Christian education" is used to signify the education in Protestant churches in order to differentiate it from the education of other religious bodies, which can be included in the term "religious education." Since "religious education" is used synonymously with "Christian education" by Harrison S. Elliott and others, it is used when it means the historical Religious Education Movement, or when it is in a quotation.

Since the term "philosophy" is used in a wider sense, "philosophy of Christian education" means the general principles, basic ideas and concepts in the field of Christian education, which are formulated into a particular system of thought.

The term, "nature of man" is used to signify the essential quality and the inherent tendencies in man primarily from the theological and psychological points of view. So also, is the phrase "man's basic needs and human growth" used to signify man's basic psychological needs and personality development. Whereas, "man's original nature" should be understood primarily from a theological perspective.

The phrase, "man in God's creation" is used to signify man's place in the world and his relationship with the natural and supernatural being from the theological point of view.

The term, "human knowledge" is used to signify the range of information or understanding through sense experience and reason.

The term, "authority" is used to signify the determinative power factor per se without limiting its usage to connote the authority structure of any institution. Therefore, when "authority" is used to signify external authority, "freedom" means internal authority.

"Objectives" is used synonymously with "goals" and "purposes." "Content" is used to signify all that is contained in the educational process in a static sense in most cases. But when it is used in a dynamic sense, an adjective "relational" is added to it. "Teaching method" is used synonymously with "educational approach." "Learning" is used synonymously with "change" by Sherrill.

### 4. Limitations

The dissertation is limited in the sense that only those writings of Elliott and Sherrill which have particular bearings on man's nature and Christian education will be surveyed for possible reference. The study will be validated by contrasting it with the findings of those who have done special studies of Elliott and/or Sherrill.

It might be desirable to study the social, cultural and historical background of Elliott and Sherrill in order to find the influence on their life and thought. But, since the dissertation deals primarily with their views of man, their philosophies of Christian education, and the relationship of the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education in each person's thought, the background study will be limited to a personal biographical survey.

The scope of the dissertation will be limited to the treatment of those topics which can be commonly found in the writings of both Sherrill and Elliott, and the relationship among them. Those topics are man in God's creation, sin and man's original nature, man's basic needs and human growth, human knowledge, freedom and authority in Christian education, the objectives and content of Christian education, teaching methods and learning theory.

The treatment of man in God's creation will be limited to the nature of man's relationships with God, others, oneself and the physical world.

The treatment of sin and man's original nature will be limited to the meaning of sin, the analysis of the problem of sin and guilt, and the issue about man's inborn capability for moral action.

The treatment of man's basic needs and human growth will be limited largely to its psychological aspect with some reference to its physiological and spiritual aspects.

The treatment of human knowledge will be limited to its pertinence to the understanding of the Christian faith and the philosophy of Christian education.

The treatment of freedom and authority in Christian education will be limited to the nature, value and function of freedom and authority in Christian education.

The treatment of the objectives of Christian education will be limited to its nature and the key statements about the educational objectives.

The treatment of the content of Christian education will be limited to its nature and major sources.

The treatment of teaching methods and learning theory will be limited to the major principles which guide the planning of the educational process and the theory of learning on which these principles are based.

The analysis of the relationship between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education in the thought of Elliott and Sherrill will be limited to the findings about their views of man and philosophies of Christian education.

The comparison of Elliott and Sherrill will be limited to the findings of their views of man and philosophies of Christian education and the findings of the relationship between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education in each person's thought.

It might be desirable to draw the actual applications of this dissertation to the present theological changes and develop a concrete program for the church today. But this will not be included in this dissertation, because of the vastness of the task which requires a careful study of the present theological change from all aspects and an accurate prediction of the direction toward which the church is bound to move.

## 5. Previous Research in the Field

So far, the research in relation to the nature of man and Christian education has been done by several scholars in one way or another. It should be noted that in recent years, William Clifton Moore and Donald Beeler Reitz did studies starting from theological views of man and then finding the implications for Christian education. In 1954, Moore completed his doctoral dissertation entitled, "Christian Education in the Light of Three Theological Views of Man," which deals with the theological concept of man in the liberal-personalistic view of Albert C. Knudson, in the neo-supernaturalistic view of Reinhold Niebuhr, and in the religious naturalistic view of Henry Nelson Wieman, and their implications for the theory and practice of Christian education, and their actual application in three selected denominations in the United States, namely, The Unitarian

Church, The Methodist Church, and The United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

In the following year, Reitz completed his investigation of three doctrines of man as they are set forth in three theological traditions; Augustinism, Thomism, and "Reconstructed Liberalism" and examined whether their implications for Christian education agree with or differ from the position of the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches in the United States of America, as expressed in its publication Christian Education Today.

The same kind of study, but in a more limited area, has been done by Robert Hansen Roberts who wrote a doctoral dissertation entitled; "Christian Education and Authentic Existence: A Study of Some Implications of the Doctrine of Man in John Macquarrie's Interpretation of Existential Theology for Christian Education" at New York University in 1966. Similarly, Lucien Edwin Coleman, Jr. made "A Comparative Study of B.F. Skinner's Concept of Human Nature and New Testament Views of Man with Reference to Methodology in Christian Education" at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary the same year.

In order to bridge the hiatus between theological presuppositions and educational methodology, very recently Robert Myson McCallister of Northwestern University made an examination of the personality theories of Gordon W. Allport

Victor E. Frankl, and Gardner W. Murphy and found their relationships to Christian education. Previous to McCallister's study, Charles Franklin McCook of Boston University wrote his dissertation on "The Self Constructs in the Writings of Selected Psychologists and Religious Education Theoriests," comparing the theories of self developed in the writings of "religious educators," William C. Bower and Randolph C. Miller and those developed in the psychologists, Erik H. Erikson, George H. Mead, Gordon W. Allport, Arther W. Combs and Donald Snyyg. The studies have been done from the psychological point of view and are about the relationship between the thought of psychologists and "religious educators."

With regard to the study related to Harrison S. Elliott and Lewis J. Sherrill, it should be noted that in 1964, F. Nile Harper of Columbia University Teachers College wrote a dissertation on "The Thought and Work of Harrison S. Elliott" in order to clarify some misunderstandings by those who are hostile toward his position.

Previous to Harper's study, Charles William Young did his S.T.M. thesis on "Theological Implications of Progressive Religious Education as Based on the Theology of the Evangelical United Brethren Church and the Views of Harrison S. Elliott, William Clayton Bower. . . " at Union Theological Seminary in 1951, and Major J. Jones wrote his Th.D. dissertation on "The Place of God in the Educative Process according to George A. Coe, William C. Bower, and Harrison S. Elliott" at Boston University School of Theology in 1957.

Some general studies about Lewis J. Sherrill and others can be found in two books, which seem to be worth mentioning. They are:

Christian Education in Theological Focus by George M. Schreyer

The Role of the Bible in Contemporary Christian Education by Sara Little

In 1966, Walter Lawrence Nyberg of New York University wrote his dissertation on "A Comparative Study of Key Concepts in the Theories of Religious Education Advocated by George Albert Coe and Lewis J. Sherrill."

These studies have some kind of relationship to the problem of this dissertation, but none of them have tackled the problem of the relationship between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education held by Harrison S. Elliott and by Lewis J. Sherrill. Even so, they are of great value to the present study.

## 6. The Method and Organization

The method of this dissertation is largely that of library research. The research will follow three major steps. The first step is to investigate the writings of Elliott and Sherrill in the light of two guiding questions: 1) What is the view of man which appears implicitly or explicitly in their writings? 2) What is the philosophy of Christian education which may be systematically expounded or fragmentarily scattered in curriculum materials or concrete suggestions for the educational program for the church? The two key books for this study are:

Can Religious Education Be Christian? by Harrison S. Elliott

The Gift of Power by Lewis J. Sherrill

The primary sources for this study, namely, their original writings, include books, articles, essays, reports, handbooks, dissertations, and inaugural addresses. Some secondary sources, i.e., writings about Elliott and Sherrill will also be investigated in the light of the above two questions.

The second step is to analyze the relationship between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education in the thought of Elliott and Sherrill.

The third step is to compare Elliott and Sherrill, in terms of their views of man, their philosophies of Christian education and the relationship between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education in each person's thought.

The dissertation is organized in the following way.

Chapter two consists of a brief biographical sketch of Elliott and Sherrill, their life events, personality (or life) patterns, and major contributions.

Chapter three consists of an investigation of Elliott's view of man in terms of his conception about man in God's creation, sin and man's original nature, man's basic needs and human growth, and human knowledge.

Chapter four consists of an investigation of Elliott's philosophy of Christian education in terms of his conception of freedom and authority in Christian education, the objectives and content of Christian education, teaching methods and learning theory.

Chapter five consists of an investigation of Sherrill's view of man in terms of his conception of man in God's creation, sin and man's original nature, man's basic needs and human growth, and human knowledge.

Chapter six consists of an investigation of Sherrill's philosophy of Christian education in terms of his understanding of freedom and authority in Christian education, the objectives and content of Christian education, teaching methods and learning theory.

Chapter seven consists of an analysis of the relationship between Elliott's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education.

Chapter eight consists of an analysis of the relationship between Sherrill's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education.

Chapter nine consists of a comparison of Elliott's and Sherrill's views of man, their philosophies of Christian education, and the relationship between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education in each person's thought.

Finally, the conclusions and implications of the dissertation will be drawn from the findings.

# CHAPTER II

## BIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION

The study of one's biographical account may shed new light and certainly will help our understadning of his thought formation. Consequently, it is appropriate and even highly important to have brief descriptions of Elliott and Sherrill, their family backgrounds, their major life events, their personality (or life) patterns and their major contributions.

### 1. Harrison S. Elliott

Hostility arises often out of misunderstanding and lack of personal contact in inter-personal relationships among the people. In recent years, as F. Nile Harper has pointed out in his dissertation,[1] there has been a tendency among Christian educators to be hostile toward Elliott's position. This may be caused not only by the change of theological climate, but also by inadequate understanding of Elliott. The purpose of this section is to provide a biographical introduction for the clarification of the misunderstandings and to eliminate unjustifiable hostility toward Elliott.

---

[1] F. Nile Harper, "The Thought and Work of Harrison S. Elliott," (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1964), p. 1.

### i. Family Background and Life Events

Harrison S. Elliott was born on December 13, 1882 in a family, which can trace its rootage to one of the Scottish clans. His father, Calvin Waston Elliott was a high school principal at St. Clarsville, Ohio. When he was six years old, his father became an ordained minister. His father's ministry was characterized by his vital concern for an educational approach because he had been a high school principal. It is also noteworthy that Harrison S. Elliott's mother was a daughter of a preacher.

Elliott (Harrison S.)[1] graduated from the high school at New Carlisle, Ohio, at the age of sixteen and went to Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio in 1899. Later on, he went to Northern Indiana Normal School and became a public school teacher for two years. For one year, he worked as a stenographer at National Cash Register Co., Dayton, Ohio (1902-1903). Probably being dissatisfied in the business world, he went to Ohio Wesleyan University for further education and also worked as a part-time secretary to President James W. Bashford and graduated with the A. B. degree in 1905. His relationship with Bashford was strengthened through the appointment and three years' life together as his secretary in China when Bashford assumed the responsibility of a bishop of Methodist Episcopal Church there.

---

[1] From now on, Harrison S. Elliott will be shortened as Elliott.

In 1908, at the age of twenty six, he began his theological education at Drew Theological Seminary. Two years later he lost his father and was appointed part-time secretary for the Y. M. C. A. Department of Student Publication and Religious Work. After his graduation from Drew Seminary with the B. D. degree, he was appointed full time secretary. While he was serving the Y. M. C. A., he did his graduate study at Union Theological Seminary and Columbia University Teachers College. At Union Seminary he took courses under George A. Coe, Harry Emerson Fosdick, and A. C. McGiffert, and at Teachers College under Edward L. Thorndike, William H. Kilpatrick, and others. "The most important influence to come out of this study was his encounter with John Dewey's thought."[1] It is through Dewey's book, How We Think that Elliott found a totally new approach. It is also about this time that he found his vocation in teaching, the most satisfying role.[2] He received the M. A. degree from Columbia University in 1922.

The next year, he was appointed an assistant professor of Religious Education at Union Theological Seminary. With his excellent service and scholarship he was promoted in a short time to associate professorship and then to be

---

[1] Harper, p. 55. [2] Ibid., p. 67.

McAlpin Professor of Practical Theology and Head of the Department of Religious Education and Psychology in 1925.

Elliott was married to Grace Loucks on June 27, 1927. To their marriage were born three children. In the year of their marriage, he was elected chairman, Y. M. C. A. National Boys' Work Committee, a position he held until 1946.

In his middle life, he did his doctoral study at Yale University (1933-1934) commuting from New York. He received his Ph. D. degree in 1940. Having strengthened his tie with the church, he was ordained to the Methodist ministry in 1944. He was elected as President of Religious Education Association (1939-1942) which he served as the General Secretary after his retirement from Union Theological Seminary in 1950.

He died on June 25, 1951 at the age of sixty eight.

### ii. Personality (or Life) Patterns

It is shown by F. Nile Harper's study that Elliott's life was characterized by his "ascetic activism" and "practical intelligence," which come from the Free Church tradition. "The activism of the Methodist tradition nourished a kind of vigorous pragmatism toward getting things accomplished."[1] How did Elliott get the Free Church heritage incorporated into his personality? It was through his life experience in personal contact with his parents at home and with teachers at schools. Elliott was influenced enormously by Bashford, "a living example of ascetic activism" and "a model of practical intelligence."[1] Antioch College which he attended at first was regarded as "a center of avid devotion to the Herbartian methodology in education." But Ohio Weslyan University which he attended later was "a center of modernity" at that time. Both President James W. Bashford and Professor Rollin H. Walker who taught the Bible there were educated at Boston University School of Theology.[2]

---

[1] Harper, p. 18.

Elliott was known as a man with open-mindedness, with courage, and "readiness to discuss delicate and complex problems."[3] His open-mindedness was expressed in his ecumenical spirit which stresses the universal church rather than denominationalism. He was ready to accept invitations from Jewish leaders to attend their educational conference as Israel S. Chipkin well pointed out in his eulogy. His life was inclusive rather than exclusive because of his liberal attitude. His predecesor at Union Seminary, George A. Coe, said of his critical depth, courage and practicality that there was no parallel within the boundary of his ac-

---

1. Harper, p. 35.

2. Harper, pp. 24-28.

3. Israel S. Chipkin, "As an Interfaith Worker: In Memorium," Religious Education, Vol. XLVI (September-October, 1951), p. 261.

quaintance.[1] In the same way, it was pointed out by F. Ernest Johnson that Elliott was one who "could be critical, almost to the point of sharpness, when he believed something fundamental to be at stake."[2] On the other hand, he was prepared to go through hell and high water in order to defend what was right, and his courage and loyalty were superb. As a professor, he "could toil terribly" to see that his students got all possible help and "complete justice in his appraisal" of their work. In regard to his practicality and his learning, Ernest J. Chave gave us a vivid description in the following sentences:

> His thoughts were the products of keen and discerning participation in many vital projects. Yet he spent much time in reading and organizing study, . . . He used books freely but he refined his thoughts in the practical tasks of a complex world. . . . He was critical and creative. . . . His methodology was democratic. He recognized the inevitability of differences and sought no conformity to a formula. . . . There was definite unity to his thinking. He was not content to leave ideas in confused dualisms . . . . One might say he was always a liberal but never a radical. . . . He was an experimentalist and a pioneer. . . a genuine Christian gentleman, a capable scholar and a teacher, a clear and constructive writer. . .[3]

---

1. George A. Coe, "On Life, Work and Influence," Religious Education, Vol. XLVI (1951), p. 264.

2. F. Ernest Johnson, "As a Colleague," Religious Education, Vol. XLVI (1951), p. 260.

3. Ernest J. Chave, "Thought Contributions of Harrison Elliott," Religious Education, Vol. XLVI (1951), pp. 262-263.

## iii. Major Contributions

In his early days, his talents had already been discovered by Bishop James. W. Bashford who wrote a letter of recommendation for him in which Bashford pointed out his three unique abilities, namely, his high rank in scholarship, his ability as a public speaker, and his ability as a writer.[1] His contributions can be seen as a scholar, a public speaker and a writer.

What did Elliott contribute to the world? Different people use different words to describe his contributions from different perspectives according to their subjective judgments which came out of their personal contacts with him. The following direct quotations would show the vast range of Elliott's contribution:

> If I were to put into one sentence what I regard as your central contribution to religious education, I would say that you have made vivid by word and by act that a scientific attitude toward education and a religious attitude toward it can become one attitude. If anyone should ask what "practical" thing you have done, I would reply that you have made religious education into something that *we do* instead of its being something that *is done* to us.[2]

---

[1] James W. Bashford, "A Letter from Bashford, Bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church, Peking, China, February 26, 1909," an appendix in F. Nile Harper's Ed. D. dissertation.

[2] George A. Coe, quoted by Ernest J. Chave, in "Thought Contributions of Harrison Elliott: Im Memorium," *Religious Education*, Vol. XLVI (1951), p. 263.

> As an understanding teacher, a resourceful counselor, and a religious educator in the fuller sense of that term, Harrison S. Elliott enriched the lives of many people. To the R. E. A. fellowship he brought sound insights, expanding hopes, and an adventurous spirit. Though he was General Secretary but a comparatively short time his unusual abilities, tireless efforts, constructive suggestions and warm religious spirit enriched the R. E. A. fellowship.[1]

> When the history of religious education in America in the first half of the twentieth century is written, the name of Harrison S. Elliott will be high on the list of pioneers. From the early years of his work among college students. . . Dr. Elliott gave himself without stint to making religion a reality through the educational process in the experience of individuals and groups. . .[2]

Elliott had demonstrated the "field theory" of personality, as pointed out by Ernest J. Chave, and he was a pioneer of the current vogue of "group dynamics." Goodwin Watson called Elliott the father of contemporary group dynamics. In his inaugural address Robert W. Lynn of Union Theological Seminary described him as "the leading theorist of group thinking and a superb practioner of what he advocated." [3] His leadership in group discussion was demonstrated in his presiding over the meetings as chairman at annual meetings of the Religious Education Association.[1]

---

[1] In a statement made by the Editorial Committee in memory of Elliott, Religious Education, Vol. XLVI (1951), p. 258.

[2] Paul Limbert, "Resolution Adopted by the Association Press Committee," Religious Education, Vol. XLVI (1951), p. 267.

[3] Robert W. Lynn, "The Religious Educators: Their Vision of Polity and Education," Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. XXI (January, 1966), p. 150.

Elliott was a resourseful counselor. His contribution to the techniques of counseling should be noted.[2] His Solving Personal Problems is a counseling manual. It shows his deep understanding of human problems. Furthermore, as pointed out by George A. Coe, "he understood the critics better than they understood themselves."[3]

Briefly, Elliott was born to an educator and preacher, was educated mostly in Methodist schools, and was greatly influenced by James W. Bashford and John Dewey. He enriched the lives of those who came into contact with him through his writings, his teaching, his counseling and administration. He was closely associated with the Y. M. C. A., Union Theological Seminary, the Religious Education Association, and the Methodist Church.

### 2. Lewis Joseph Sherrill

Elliott was from the north of the United States, while Sherrill was from the south. The difference between the north and the south may be reflected in their lives and thoughts. Having discussed briefly the life of Elliott, we now turn to Sherrill's life events, his personality (or life) patterns, and his major contributions.

---

[1] "Report for the Annual Meeting of the Association: Religion in Higher Education," Religious Education, Vol. XXXVII (1944), pp. 146-147, 149, 155-157, 160.

[2] Editor's comment on Elliott in International Journal of Religious Education, Vol. XVII (1940), p. 8.

[3] George A. Coe, "On Life, Work and Influences," Religious Education, Vol. XLVI (1951), p. 264.

## i. Family Background and Life Events

On April 18, 1892, Lewis J. Sherrill was born in a devoted Presbyterian family at Haskell, Texas. His father was a lay business man, yet his zeal for the "Word of God" made him learn Hebrew and Greek so that he could understand the Scriptures better.[1]

After his high school education, Sherrill entered Austin College and graduated with the A. B. degree at the age of twenty four in 1916. He continued his education at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, preparing himself for the ministry and received the B.D. degree in 1921.

On May 12, 1921 Sherrill was married to Helen Hardwicke of Sherman, Texas, a trained social worker, who in her late years taught at Union Theological Seminary and was Dean to Women Students. Their family provided warm fellowship not only for their two children, John and Mary, to grow into maturity but also enriched the lives of those who came into contact with the family. "To him, the family was a 'we-relationship'."[2] This shows the quality of their

---

1. Frank H. Caldwell, "An Appreciation of a Friend," A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill, Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, (1957), unpaged.

2. Ibid.

family relationship.

Having finished his seminary education, he was ordained and served as pastor at the First Presbyterian Church, Covington, Tennessee for four years (1921-1925). After an outstanding pastorate, he was appointed Professor of Religious Education at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary. At the same time, he was honored with the D. D. degree by Austin College, where he did his undergraduate work. Later, he studied at Northwestern University[1] and Yale University. He received his Ph.D. degree from Yale at the age of thirty seven.[2] Then he was promoted to be the Dean of Louisville Presbyterian Seminary where he served for twenty five years untill 1950. During this period, Sherrill was elected as the Executive Secretary of the Association of American Theological Schools (1935-1938) and President of the Association (1939-1940). Previously, he was named chairman of the Curriculum Committee of the Conference on Theological Schools in 1930. It was evident that he handled his responsibilities exceedingly well and no man's judgment had more weight than his. He was awarded the Litt. D. degree by Davidson College in 1937. He was also appointed the Director of

---

1. Roy W. Fairchild, "The Contributions of Lewis J. Sherrill to Christian Education," *Religious Education*, Vol. LIII, (1958), p. 403.

2. Luther A. Weigle, "Dr. Sherrill as a Student," *A Volume of Memorials: Lewis J. Sherrill*, unpaged.

the Religious Education Re-study for the Presbyterian Church in the United States. In his later years, he was called to be Skinner and McAlpin Professor of Practical Theology at Union Theological Seminary as the successor to Harrison S. Elliott. He served with distinction for seven years in spite of the loss of sight.

Sherrill died on January 28, 1957 at the age of sixty five. The funeral was held in Harbson Memorial Chapel at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary on January 31. Shortly thereafter, a memorial service was held in James Chapel at Union Theological Seminary.

### iii. Personality (or Life) Patterns

One thing stands out in Sherrill's life; he was a "servant of the Word." As he was losing his sight, drawing toward blindness, he did not complain, give up his study of the Word, nor fall into a state of despair. On the contrary, he learned Braille quietly and persistently, hoping that through his fingers he might still be open to God's revelation.[2] This is due to the influence of his father during his childhood and thereafter through the kind of education he received mostly within the Presbyterian tradition. Nobody has ever studied Sherrill's

---

1. Reinhold Niebuhr, "In Memorium"; a prayer at the memorial service, Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. XII, (1957), p. 79.

2. Caldwell, "An Appreciation of a Friend."

life in depth to find his model as he formulated his philosophy of life. However, Sara Little seems to suggest that Sherrill was particularly influenced by three eminent theologians; Emil Brunner, William Temple and Richard Niebuhr.[1]

What kind of man was Lewis J. Sherrill? From the prayer of Reinhold Niebuhr at the memorial service, one could answer that he was a man with "quiet dignity of spirit," "unpretentious goodness which rebuked our vanities and brought us to our true selves," and that he was a man of "uncomplaining patience," a man of "love," a man of "learning," and a man of "discernment."[2]

Similarly, Roy W. Fairchild describes Sherrill as being "a warm, vibrant human being possessing a depth of patience with understanding of the problems of his fellow human beings." Sherrill was a man ever growing, "ever ready to acknowledge gaps in his own knowledge and weakness in his own theory."[3] He was open-minded and a man of humility. He practiced the methods which he advocated, namely, the method of two way communication.

---

1. Sara Little, The Role of the Bible in Contemporary Christian Education, Richmond, Virginia: Knox Press, (1961), p. 84.

2. Niebuhr, "In Memorium"; a prayer at the memorial service, Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. XII, p. 79.

3. Fairchild, "The Contribution of Lewis J. Sherrill to Christian Education," Religious Education, Vol. LIII, p. 403.

As a preacher, Sherrill showed the characteristics of his real self through the pulpit, his powerful sincerity and earnestness, his "personal encounter with God," his capture of "the meaning of the living victorious presence of Christ," his love and understanding of the congregation.[1]

As a teacher, he impressed his students with his friendliness, scholarship, and his "genius for teaching people when they least suspected that they were being taught."[2] He required students to do hard work because he himself was capable of hard work. Being so impressed by Sherrill, David William Jewell says in the preface to his dissertation in admiration and gratitude that "were there to be a dedication it would be in grateful memory of Lewis J. Sherrill, a beloved teacher, an understanding colleague, and a warm friend."[3]

As a leader, he was prized by Walter N. Roberts with the following words:

> His quiet manner, his deep reverence for personality, his unfailing patience, his thoughtful consideration of others, and his ability to call forth the best in those who came under his influence set him apart as a teacher par excellence. . . . He never tried to force himself or his ideas upon another, but patiently and

---

[1] William A. Benfield, "Dr. Sherrill as a Preacher," A Volume of Memorials: Lewis J. Sherrill, (1957), unpaged.

[2] Norman A. Horner, "Dr. Sherrill as a Teacher," A Volume of Memorials, unpaged.

[3] David William Jewell, "Aspects of Authority in Christian Education in Historical Perspective," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1958), p. iii.

> reverently waited for one's best to come forth. His profound gentleness and deep courtesy were so much like the gentleness and courtesy of God.[1]

As a friend, his loyalty stands the test of difficulties in life. He was a friend in need and a friend indeed. John R. Cunningham regarded it to be his fortune to have a friend like Sherrill, who showed his unchanging loyalty to him in time of hardship. Cunningham portrayed this friend as a man of "truly strong character and selfless man of God." He was "quiet, unassuming, patient and wise." He was not a narrow dogmatist. On the contrary, "he was broad enough in spirit to differ and yet to be loyal." He won friendship even among many a young man who was his student and knew him.[2] Sherrill might have been observed as a bit unsociable because at times he "refused some kinds of fellowship and service which others eagerly responded to." Julian Price Love rightly interpreted such not as "selfish seclusion," but as his "high dedication" and "strict adherence to his particular call."[3]

### iii. Major Contributions

One's contribution in life to the world is always determined by his ability and the opportunity for his ability to find expression. From his life events, we can imagine the opportunities Sherrill had and would have had in his total life span. But what was his ability? We can find some kind of answer from the words of description about Sherrill as a student by Luther A. Weigle, Dean of Yale Divinity School and his major professor at Yale. Weigle was impressed by his maturity and talents and wrote:

---

[1] Walter N. Roberts, "Dr. Sherrill as a Leader in Theological Education," A Volume of Memorials, unpaged.

[2] John R. Cunningham, "Dr. Sherrill as a Friend," Memorials.

[3] Julian Price Love, "Dr. Sherrill's Philosophy of Life," Memorials.

> As a graduate student, Sherrill was a joy. He was mature, . . . But he had more than maturity. He was a born research scholar, a clear writer, and an effective and stimulating teacher. . ... Because of his outstanding work as a graduate student and as a teacher, Dr. Sherrill was named chairman of the Curriculum Committee of the Conference on Theological Schools in 1930.[1]

As a Christian educator, Sherrill made his contribution in the formation of new philosophy of Christian education. He "attempted to keep abreast of the advances in both education and theology. It was his hope to utilize the insights of both these disciplines"[2] in formulating a new philosophy of Christian education. Consequently, Henry P. Van Dusen, President of Union Theological Seminary, attributed to Sherrill the honor of being "a chief architect" of the re-orientation that has been taking place within

---

1. Luther A. Weigle, "Dr. Sherrill as a Student," A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill, unpaged.

2. Walter Lawrence Nyberg, "A Comparative Study of Key Concepts in the Theories of Religious Education Advocated by George A. Coe and Lewis J. Sherrill," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, (1966), p. 16.

Christian education since the late 1940s.[1] In his review of The Gift of Power also, E. G. Homrighausen of Princeton Seminary made the same kind of comment about Sherrill saying:

> A book by Lewis J. Sherrill is always both scholarly and useful. He has a way of writing about pertinent issues with authority, wisdom and clarity. His Guilt and Redemption (1945) is one of our finest studies on the subject from the Christian point of view. His recent study in the psychology of human development, The Struggles (sic) of the Soul (1951), is a distinct Christian contribution to the field. In the book under review, Dr. Sherrill gathers up all this accumulated knowledge, intellectual skill and pastoral wisdom to give us what may be termed a new philosophy of Christian education which is taking shape.[2]

Indeed, this made Norman A. Horner say in his eulogy about Sherrill, "Christian education as the church understands it was being fashioned in his competent hands."[3] He contributed to Christian education not only as a theorist, but also as a superb practioner of his theory and demonstrated himself to be a good teacher. Horner also pointed out that the supreme skill of Sherrill in teaching was "his ability to help people grow." "Creative education and group dynamics" were his regular procedure in the classroom. "Not

---

1. Henry P. Van Dusen, "A Review of The Gift of Power by Sherrill," Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. XI (May, 1956), p. 59.

2. E. G. Homrighausen, "Review of The Gift of Power by Sherrill," Christian Century, Vol. 73, No. 1 (January 4, 1956), p. 14.

3. Norman A. Horner, "Dr. Sherrill as a Teacher," A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill, unpaged.

all of his students retained the detailed wealth of knowledge he imparted, . . . yet no one of us failed to see himself and his ministry in an exciting, different light."[1]

As an author, Sherrill wrote twelve books and numberous articles which have helped to bring Christian education out of its shallowness and superficialities into depth and sound foundations. In spite of heavy duties in his Dean's Office and his teaching responsibilities he steadily developed his philosophy of Christian education through a painstaking process and published it in four volumes in the 1930s, namely, Adult Education in the Church (1939), Family and Church (1937), Understanding Children (1939) and The Opening Doors of Childhood (1939). In his later years, he refined his philosophy of Christian education with great depth and published it in his The Gift of Power, which commands such a high reputation, as "the first great positive contribution and perhaps the best to the philsophy of Christian education."[2] His greatest contribution to Christian education is through his writing. Unfortunately he did not complete his second volume of The Rise of Christian Education, an excellent historical study of Christian education.

---

1. Norman A. Horner, "Dr. Sherrill as a Teacher," A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill, unpaged.

2. Henry G. Goodykoontz, "Dr. Sherrill as an Author," A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill, unpaged.

As a theological educator, Sherrill contributed to the ministry of the church through his teaching at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary and Union Theological Seminary and also through his participation in the work of the Association of American Theological Schools as its first General Secretary and its President. His contribution to the Association made Walter N. Roberts, its President at the time of Sherrill's death, say in his memory:

> Whatever influence the Association of American Theological Schools had had in shaping theological education in America from 1935 to 1957, Lewis J. Sherrill has had the profoundest influence of all.[1]

With regard to Sherrill's contribution, it would be a great mistake to neglect his contribution to people through inter-personal relationships in a counseling situation or in other occasions. His home was often the center of fellowship for other families at many a Christmas "as a spring feeds a river." His family life nourished the needs of other families like an overflowing river in a dry land. His influence was mediated through "counseling with persons of the community, helping them through the crisis of black despair, healing the broken-hearted and helping toward adjustment."[2] Sherrill was superbly skilled in counseling. He was always "the favorite counselor along with David Roberts"

---

1. Walter N. Roberts, "Dr. Sherrill as a Leader in Theological Education," A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill, unpaged.

2. Frank H. Caldwell, "An Appreciation of a Friend," Memorials, unpaged.

at Union Seminary.[1] Edward S. Golden, who used to be Sherrill's student both at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary and Union Seminary, expressed his appreciation of his teacher's contribution as a counselor in the following words:

> Dr. Sherrill knew of the soul struggles of his students; of those intellectual irritants that disturbed the foundations of one's being, and of those unresolved emtional conflicts that inhibited learning and retarded growth. . . . Dr. Sherrill's prestige and position as dean, professor, author, psychologist, theologian, educator and saint combined to create within the student much fear and hesitation. These feelings were soon dispelled as he emptied himself in behalf of his students. . . . It was not what he said, because he said very little. . . . One could accept oneself, because he accepted as you were. . . he always guided the counselee to become responsible and better equipped emotionally to handle his life more efficiently. Never was advice or judgment pronounced. . .[2]

Sherrill was born to a devoted Christian family, was educated mostly in Presbyterian schools, and was greatly infleuenced by the Reformed tradition. He enriched the lives of those who came into contact with him through his writings, his teaching, his counseling and administration. He was closely related to Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, Union Seminary, the Association of American Theological Schools, and the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

---

1. Roy W. Fairchild, "The Contribution of Lewis J. Sherrill to Christian Education," Religious Education, Vol. LIII, p. 404.

2. Edward S. Golden, "Dr. Sherrill as a Counselor," Memorials, unpaged.

# CHAPTER III

## ELLIOTT'S VIEW OF MAN

We now turn to the first major step of research in investigating the writings of Elliott and find his view of man in this chapter and his philosophy of Christian education in the next chapter. The purpose is to determine his view of man from both theological and psychological perspectives. The treatment of Elliott's view of man will be centered around those issues which are pertinent to the dissertation. They are: man in God's creation, sin and man's original nature, man's basic needs and human growth, and human knowledge. Those issues are theologically important and educationally relevant. "Any philosophy of education, Christian or otherwise, must be concerned with the nature of personality, the process of human development. . . ."[1]

### 1. Man in God's Creation

In studying Elliott's thought, one can not easily find his concept of creation because he does not approach the problem of human nature based purely on the Biblical account

---

1. Lawrence C. Little, Foundations for a Philosophy of Christian Education, (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962) p. 41.

in Genesis nor from the Christological point of view as some neo-orthodox theologians do. He does not confine his understanding of human nature to God's revelation which is recorded in the Bible because he sees discoveries of modern psychology very helpful in understanding human nature. From his strong emphasis on God's immanence in nature and his concept which may well be called the "personality principle" one can speculate regarding his ideas of man's relation to God and to nature, namely, man's place in God's creation. He does not stress the infinite difference between God and man. He does not emphasize God as the Creator and man as His creature, nor the difference between man and the universe. He does not adore man as the crown of God's creation and despise nature as something to be dominated by man. He rather sees the relationship between God and man, between God and nature, and between man and nature from the point of view of harmony.

He summarizes neo-orthodox theologians' interpretation of the Creation story,[1] but he dissociates himself from them saying "this is the source of the human predicament, according to *these* interpreters of the Christian faith."[2] He repudiates Emil Brunner's concept of God and man's relation to God, because it seems to presuppose

---

[1] Harrison S. Elliott, *Can Religious Education Be Christian?*, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947), pp. 142-144.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

"the situation of a son who has inherited from his parents a superior endowment," but the relationship between son and parents is legalistic. The relationship between them is not personal; the father's word should be obeyed unquestionably and any self-assertion on the part of the son for growth and freedom is considered "by the father as an infringement of his sovereign rights as the head of the home and as rebellion."[1] The son is not entitled to have his own will but to "yield in complete submission to his father and to receive everything as the gift from his father."[2]

But for Elliott, man's relation to God is not this kind of sovereign rule and unquestioning submission which does not allow any partnership and comradeship between God and man, which Brunner describes as mockery.[3] The son's relation to his parents is a loving, personal relation which allows freedom and personal choice, and which provides opportunity for growth and making decisions. Man's relation to God is not an authoritarian one, but a democratic one. Even scientists can be good co-workers with God, as they discover the wonderful resources in the universe and God's mystery in nature. It is through human personality and our larger acquaintance with the universe that

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian? p. 146.
2. Ibid., p. 147.
3. Ibid., p. 148.

God is known as the "Universe Personality."[1] With regard to this point, Elliott writes:

> We must think of personality in psychological terms and remember that the physical and spiritual represent simply aspects of a personality and that they exist together. . . . Our difficulty in understanding God is of the same sort as our difficulty in understanding human personality. As we have sought to find the real self apart from the physical body, so we try to find God apart from the universe. In this sense, our conception is pantheistic. God is immanent and everywhere. . . . He is as distinctive as any personality is distinctive in the body.[2]

God is a personal God with whom man can have communion, but "most people do not have communion with God because they have not shared the experiences of life sufficiently with Him to have any basis for such communion."[3] They do not know Him enough to comprehend His purposes nor to have relationship with Him. It is clear that although Elliott stresses the harmony and closeness of God, man, and nature, yet he does not fall into pantheism.[4] He is aware of the fact that even though God works in and through nature, yet He can not be identified with nature.

As one can imagine from Elliott's "personality prin-

---

1. Harrison S. Elliott, The Bearing of Psychology upon Religion, (New York: The Association Press, 1927), p. 59. Also see, Major J. Jones, "The Place of God in the Educative Process according to George A. Coe, William C. Bower, and Harrison S. Elliott," Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1957, p. 279.

2. Elliott, The Bearing of Psychology upon Religion, pp. 62-63.

3. Ibid., p. 72.

4. Ibid., p. 63.

ciple," man's freedom is an important factor in his view of man. God's resources in nature are discovered by scientists, but man "is not forced to meet the condition for the release of the resources which are God. . . .Man is free to reject them. This is true even in human relationships."[1] In his article entitle "Religion and Democratic Society," he points out that even in the Old Testament, the people of Israel were given the right to make choices and decisions saying, "Saul and David were both the people's choice."[2]

Along with freedom, Elliott also stresses human responsibility and human effort. His theory of counseling is based on the acceptance of responsibility in meeting the every day situations of life.[3] The importance of human effort can be seen from his emphasis that God's resources are abundant in the world, "but the prayer for plenty will be answered only as man is willing to do his part in discovering and meeting the conditions. . ."[4] Verbal prayers are of no avail in saving the nations from the danger of destroying civilizations. "It will be met only as nations are willing to meet the conditions under which love is re-

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, pp. 296-297.

2. ______, "Religion and Democratic Society," Religious Education, Vol. XLV (1950), p. 285.

3. ______, "Individual and Group Counseling," Orientation in Religious Education edited by Philip H. Lotz, (New York: Abingdon Press, 1950), p. 183.

4. ______, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 295.

leased in the relationship between nations."[1]

Based on his "personality principle," it is not difficult to understand Elliott's emphasis on man's social nature. "Individuals express themselves in groups and have their characteristics shaped in a social medium." His concern for a social gospel and social theory of religious education is based on his understanding of man in his social context. Man can not be cut off from his social melieu.[2]

It should also be noted that according to Elliott, man is more than animal. "The animal seems to be completely at the mercy of its emergency apparatus, but man is not." Man is capable of meeting emergency rationally, because "man can learn to 'keep his head' in the presence of danger."[3]

Furthermore, "human beings can make their eating a social and aesthetic event; they can use their sex relations not only to reproduce their kind but to give expression to love."[4] In other words, it is man who alone is capable of creating civilization. This can not be found

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, pp. 294-295.

2. ______, The Bearing of Psychology upon Religion, pp. 24-25. Also see, Jones, "The Place of God . . .," p. 289.

3. ______, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 216.

4. ______, Solving Personal Problems: A Counseling Manual, (New York: H. Holt and Co., 1936), p. 6.

among the animals. Man can express the spiritual through physical manifestation. This does not mean that Elliott minimizes the importance of the human physical body. He says, "To deny the physical medium is to rob human beings of any form of spiritual expression."[1]

Briefly, Elliott sees man in God's creation as a unique being in personal relation to God, with freedom and responsibility, because man is a personality. Man is an individual in need of a group. Man is more than an animal. He is capable of rational, aesthetic, and spiritual expression through the physical medium.

### 2. Sin and Man's Original Nature

The problem of sin and man's original nature is related to the concept of man in God's creation. Based on our previous discussion about Elliott's concept of man's relation to God and nature and his place in the world, we can understand his concept of sin with considerable accuracy.

Elliott repudiates the concept of sin as it is expounded by neo-orthodox theologians. According to Barth and Brunner, sin is man's rebellion against the sovereign God. It is the act of man's willful decision like a son's willful assertion to be above the father. Elliott does not

---

1. Elliott, Solving Personal Problems: A Counseling Manual, p. 163.

regard all kinds of self-assertion as sin. "Some types of self-assertion are the conditions of growth."[1] When one grows up from childhood into adulthood, his assertion to become an independent person with his human dignity is necessary and healthy for a growing assumption of responsibility. It seems to Elliott that

> the attempt to interpret the self-assertion of man as sinful and as an evidence against God is to carry over into religion the same sort of interpretation parents often make of this conduct in children.[2]

Human progress often comes from bold self-assertion of man in opposition to bad conditions in the world. Therefore, there is a legitimate place for self-assertion. If the son assumes that all he is and has accomplished has been entirely of himself and ignore the existence of his father and his dependency on him, his self-assertion is sin. Likewise, if man fails to acknowledge his dependence on God and the resources of the universe, his self-assertion is sin. What God wants of man is not a kind of servile submission. True humility does not deny the possibilities of comradeship with God. This comradeship does not mean the equality between God and man as Brunner assumes.[3] It is in such

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, pp. 157-158.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., pp. 146, 158-159.

comradeship that God becomes a living reality.

Gaining insight from Paul Tillich and Otto Rank, Elliott sees the close relationship between guilt and man's effort to rebel against authority, human or divine. In the authoritarian society sin is bound to be interpreted in terms of rebellion. This can be seen in the German Protestant manifestation of the problem in relation to authority. On the contrary, sin is often interpreted in terms of egoism, pride and self-centeredness in the democratic American scene. It seems to Elliott that the interpretation has varied, and that the particular interpretation shows distinctly the influence of the cultural situation.[1]

In his analysis of sin, Elliott points out that often the normal sexual drive is misunderstood to be a serious sin during the adolescent period. "Especially guilt was attached to the sex exploration of masturbation and similar practices."[2] Conversion used to be regarded as the method to stop masturbation. From Elliott's point of view, the sexual drive itself is not sinful.

Elliott also comments on Paul's ideas of sin in Paul's Letter to the Galatians, saying that there are two groups of sins, "sins of the appetite" and "sins of the will or "ego." Basically, "the causes of a sense of guilt

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, pp. 162-169.

2. _______, Solving Personal Problems, p. 140.

have varied, for guilt is not inevitably connected with one particular type of behavior or attitude, but is related to that which is disapproved."[1] Whether a particular behavior or attitude is disapproved or not, is to be seen from its cultural background. Elliott points out the danger of accepting the interpretation of sin which grows out of German Lutheran and Reformed background into the American culture.

Another important point in Elliott's concept of sin is that he warns against morbid self-sacrifice, which is often regarded as virtuous and good. He emphatically states:

> Sacrificing the self for the sake of others can become sin when it so dominates the individual that his or her ego rights are unduly sacrificed. . . .True responsibility is neither excessively ego-striving nor love-sacrificing, but an integration of these opposites in true responsibility. . . an exaggerated sense of sin and guilt is as ego-centered as is excessive pride and self-assertion.[2]

Elliott has exposed the real picture of egoism which is so often neglected by too much generalization and over-simplification. From his psychological insights Elliott also points out that an undue sense of sin and guilt will turn the individual to self-destruction. "Feelings of sin and guilt are not much service except as they lead the individual to do something positive about the situation."[1] Not every act of sin is equally serious in the sight of God. The sense of seriousness must not be out of proportion. Otherwise, it tends to lead to personal recrimination.

---

[1] Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 165.

[2] Ibid., pp. 170-171.

> There is often failure to see that an exaggerated sense of sin and guilt is as ego-centered as is excessive pride and self-assertion. The latter is ego-centeredness in times of success; the former in times of defeat and failure.[2]

It is significant that Elliott makes a distinction between sin and the sick personality. This is to recognize "that many individuals who look like sinners are really the victims of circumstances beyond their control and are not responsible sinners."[3] Based on modern medicine and mental hygiene, Elliott points out that bad conduct is "not due to the evil nature of the individual; neither is it sin. It is a symptom of personality ill health."[4] Stealing, lying, bad temper, undesirable sex behavior are learned in one's experiences with his parents and others with whom he has associated. But one can not choose his parents, his home and given surroundings during his formative years of life. Both the Protestant and the Catholic method of dealing with sinful acts are inadequate because their diagnosis of the source of the personality problem is inadequate and superficial. Their assumption is that "sinful acts are due to the individual's failure to accept the grace of God through Christ, . . ."[1] The assumption that sinful acts are due to man's unwillingness to yield his life to God's direction is an over-simplified religious statement. Without diagnosis of personality problems in depth, one can not deal with sinful acts adequately. He calls religious leaders to a more careful diagnosis of the problem of sin. What seems to be ego-striving and selfish pride may be in fact an effort to cover extreme sensitiveness and fear. The sick person often puts up a brave front of defense which seems to be sinful ego-striving, but at the bottom of his heart, he is repentent. It is clear from the four Gospels that those who deserve blame and condemnation are not "sinners," but those self-righteous leaders of the society. Therefore, "instead of focusing attention upon the individual wrong-doer, there should be more sense of social responsibility and a larger consciousness of social sin."[2]

---

[1] Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 171.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 175.

[4] ______, "Mental Hygiene and Religious Education," Religious Education, Vol. XXIV (1929), p. 616.

The problem of sin is related to man's original nature. What is Elliott's view about man's original nature?

---

[1] Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 293.

[2] ______, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 175.

It is evident from his writings that he is in opposition to the neo-orthodox theologians who emphasizes the total depravity of human nature and the necessity for a special act of divine grace. Rather he is on the side of liberal educators who stress the possibility of modification of the inborn capacities.[1] He sees the Pauline conception of the sinfulness of man as being so "different in degree" from "the current ones in the primitive church and from those of the synoptic gospels" that it is almost a different kind. Paul claims that he has direct revelation from God. No matter how biblical scholars interpret the fact that "Paul became convinced, out of his experience, that all human attempts were helpless, only plunging man into a deep sense of sin," Elliott regards Pauline interpretation of human total depravity and sinfulness of nature as "radically different from the Old Testament and the synoptic Jesus. . . . There was no such extreme conception of the inability of man to do any good as is found in Paul."[2]

According to Elliott, the right understanding of man's original nature comes from empirical science, particularly psychology, which proves that the dogmatic pessimism about human nature is wrong, and that "there is no-

---

1. Jones, "The Place of God in the Educative Process. . .," p. 285. Also see, Nyberg, "A Comparative Study of Key Concepts. . .," p. 40.

2. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, pp. 105-106.

thing in human nature with a pre-determining influence that the individual will be a saint or a devil."[1] There are possibilities for either or both. The conception about man's original nature is so strongly kept that it comes out so frequently in his writings. In his essay, "The Findings of Modern Psychology and the Potentialities of Human Life," Elliott summarizes five points which psychology has to say with regard to the possibilities of human life.[2] They are:

1) The limit and range of what may be developed in any individual is inborn in him. Individuals differ in this native equipment.

2) Original nature does not pre-determine personalty.

3) Human characteristics are modifiable.

4) The capacity for growth is very large, seemingly unlimited.

5) Human beings have within themselves the capacities which make for their own improvement and development and the basis for the dynamic which leads them on to the realization of their purposes.

Human nature is not pre-determined either for good

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 197.

2. ______, "The Findings of Modern Psychology and the Potentialities of Human Life," in Religion on Campus edited by Francis P. Miller, New York: Association Press, (1927), pp. 155-156.

or evil. It is "a-moral."[1] Whether it is developed in a good way, or an evil way depends upon what happens to the man in his life experiences. In his study of Elliott's thought, F. Nile Harper summarizes the development of Elliott's view of man in the following words:

> Elliott's view of man was the most unchanging element in his entire theological position. He began in the teens with a view of human nature as neutral. Early in his career he found in experimental psychology an empirical way of expressing his Arminian optimism about man's possibilities. . . . By 1927, man's potential for growth far outstripped any other aspect of his situation in Elliott's thought. Further, just as individual men can rebuild their personalities, so society can reconstruct its corporate character. In 1936, Elliott stated that while the importance of social factors in the formation of personality had been underestimated, the basic plasticity of man's nature and his great potential for growth were still the most basic elements in his view of man. In 1940, Elliott had less optimism about reconstructing society and a more sober estimate of man's potential, but he strongly re-affirmed in the same psychological terms his earlier view of the neutrality of man's original nature and the plasticity of his personality. For him to have denied these elements of faith would have required him to take a position basically different from his free church committment to the freedom of man and his capacity for growth in faith and life.[2]

Sherrill points out a few things which struck him most forcibly when he thinks about Elliott's influence upon people saying "The heart of the matter, I think, is that Dr. Elliott believed profoundly in people."[1] His faith in man was a corrective in the midst of despair concerning man's nature.

---

[1] Nyberg, "A Comparative Study of Key Concepts. . .," p. 40.

[2] Harper, "The Thought and Work of Harrison S. Elliott," pp. 265-266.

In his study, William Clifton Moore points out that Elliott's understanding of Reinhold Niebuhr's view of man was based on Niebuhr's writings prior to his The Nature and Destiny of Man.[2] This may influence the accuracy of his understanding of neo-orthodoxy. But on the whole, Elliott's understanding of neo-orthodoxy comes from the early writings of Karl Barth and Emil Brunner. This can be found from his Can Religious Education Be Christian?, a polemical book against neo-orthodoxy.

Briefly, Elliott does not interpret sin as rebellion unconditionally. There is a legitimate place for self-assertion in the process of one's growth from childhood into maturity. The particular interpretation of sin is often influenced by its cultural situation. "Sinners" are often victims of an unjust social order. Sin should be differentiated from the sick personality in order to avoid superficial treatment of the problem of sin. Man's original nature is not evil, nor good. It is neutral and a-moral.

---

1. Lewis J. Sherrill, "Harrison Sacket Elliott," Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. VII (1951), pp. 30-31.

2. Wm. Clifton Moore, "Christian Education in the Light of Three Theological Views of Man," p. 5.

Man has great potentialities for growth and for using the inestimable resources of God

### 3. Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth

What are man's basic needs? To this question, Elliott does not give a direct answer. One can not find a clear view about man's basic needs from his writings except his strong emphasis on love, acceptance, and security which can be regarded as the soil for personality development. Deprivation of love either of a parent or a leader may cause stealing or other kinds of personality problems.[1]

With regard to man's basic needs, it is significant that Elliott quotes from Reinhold Niebuhr's conception about man's dual natural impulses--"selfish or eogistic and unselfish or social."[2] Elliott points out that Niebuhr's conception has been the prevailing one in "liberal" education. It was even followed by leaders of "religious education" such as George A. Coe with whom Elliott did his study.

These two nautral impulses are related to man's needs for love, acceptance, and security. Love can be both egoistic and social. Security does not mean coward, inner-directed status quo because Elliott emphasizes that "we

---

1. Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 237.

2. ______, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 181.

cannot, if we would, develop security to the point where there is no individual risk. . . ."[1] A secure person is not closed to himself. Security does not prohibit risk and adventure. On the contrary, because of the security one has, he is able to move out in adventure. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider that Elliott agrees with Niebuhr on man's natural impulses, which though different in terminology, means man's basic needs.

How does man grow from his birth to old age? What are the major problems at each stage in one's life span? As an experienced counselor, Elliott is able to see problems one has to face in his growth from birth to death at every stage. In order to have a satisfactory life journey one has to have the opportunity to live each stage so successfully that he is able to move to the next stage without fixation or regression.[2] In human growth, each individual is different from others in his "inborn equipment," his speed of growth, and his kinds of life experiences. Each one is different from others physiologically and psychologically. One's chronological age and psychological age may not be the same because "the psychological duration of each period varies and has to be understood

---

1. Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, pp. 51-52.

2. Ibid., pp. 24-25.

for each individual."[1]

Elliott uses the plant as an analogy to illustrate personality development, whose basic factor is security, which "has to do with guarantees to the individual's ability to keep alive" physically and emotionally, "through maintaining self-respect, . . . being needed in the world, being given a place in the social relationships. . ."[2] The second factor in healthy personality development is "success or achievement," which might be likened to rain, whereas security would be the soil. "But too easy success also is harmful. . . it tends to develop an exaggerated sense of importance and to unfit one for life's everyday concerns."[3] The healthy development of personality requires surroundings which demand some effort to succeed and in which one may also fail. But one must succeed "sufficiently to give him a sense of achievement and of being useful to his world."[4] The third factor in healthy personality development is "the social atomosphere in which the individual lives and works, and which may well be likened to the sunshine of the plant-world."[5] This means warm relationships among people, loving concern for others, mutual co-operation, goodwill for others, a sense of brotherhood, solidarity, and the like. Those whose conditions are too difficult for them to cope with are "dwarfed and warped in personality." To a great extent, insanity comes not from defect or deterioration in brain or nervous system but from "insupportable experiences of life."[1] Briefly, security, love and success are essential for personality development.

---

[1] Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 17.

[2] Ibid., p. 49.

[3] Ibid., p. 52.

[4] Ibid., p. 53.

[5] Ibid., p. 56.

Elliott divides the life span into six stages; infancy, childhood, adolescence, early maturity, middle life and old age.[2] He does not systematically expound the major problems in each stage as Sherrill does in his book The Struggle of the Soul; rather he combines his understanding of the problems of personality development with his concern and understanding of counseling technique into one volume, Solving Personal Problems: A Counseling Manual, a joint enterprise with his wife, Grace Loucks Elliott.

The infancy period is characterized by almost complete dependence on parents and others for care and protection. Gradually one learns to walk, to talk, to dress and to feed oneself. His dependence on others decreases gradually. Elliott depicts the feeling of a newborn

---

1. Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 46.

2. Ibid., p. 11.

baby that "the world must be a cold and even hostile place in comparison with the warm and comfort of intra-utrine existence."[1] One looks back to the "paradise" prior to birth with nostalgia, because "to be born is to face struggle and conflict, to be willing to be an individual separate from all other individuals. . . ."[2]

According to Elliott's classification of various stages of life, early childhood does not stand separately as one of them. In his writings, the term "early childhood" appear twice and in both instances it is related to infancy as if early childhood has closer relationship with infancy rather than the rest of childhood because the period of infancy and early childhood generally closes with going to school at six.[3]

What is the major problem during childhood? It is that of "growing up." "Life for a child is a series of deprivations as he grows older."[4] Whether one has successfully lived through his early life or not depends on the gradual decrease of protection by others and the gradual increase of assuming one's responsibility so that one becomes an adult psychologically as well as physiologically. "The goal of early life. . . is the mature responsibility

---

1. Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 33.

2. Ibid. 3. Ibid., p. 12

4. Ibid., p. 122.

of the late teens and the twenties."[1] It aims for greater self-protection and self-direction.

Elliott points out the importance of the first six years in building up one's style of life and the influence of parents during this period. He writes:

> The little child sees the outside world through the eyes of his parents. He has little first-hand experience as to what things are harmful and are to be avoided and what things are to be accepted. This he learns by the emotional attitudes of his parents. Consequently, the world is interpreted in terms of the emotional attitudes and emotional life of the home.[2]

In later years, one tends to establish relations with people who assume authority as parent substitutes.[3] The basic attitudes are developed in these formative years "so that by adolescence the individual's patterns for meeting life are for the most part formed."[4]

Elliott gives concrete illustrations as to how parents set different patterns of life and personality upon their children by way of their dealings with children. Parents who set standards beyond the children's achievement tend to make their children feel guilty and inferior

---

1. Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 14.

2. ______, "Shifting Psychologies and Their Bearing on Social Change," Religious Education, Vol. XXV (1930), p. 557.

3, Op. cit., pp. 42, 250.     4. Op. cit., p. 43.

as well as they themselves.[1] Parents who finish children's sentences often make children talk less easily and freely. Parents who decide things for children tend to make children less secure and confident. Parents who make social contacts for their children tend to make them over-demanding, seeking for an ideal friend.[2]

Adolescence is a period in which one reaches "a stage of physical and psychological maturity" and is able to leave the protection and direction of others, and by taking on responsibilities which are his own. "The individual is no longer at the mercy of circumstances: he can do something about the conditions he faces. But he does not attain maturity all at once."[3]

Elliott describes adolescence as a time of "major transition in the growing up process." It is a time to wave the necessary "flags of independence," to announce that one is no longer a little child, to refuse to go to church in protest of parents' authority, to adopt slovenliness in opposition to parents' over-concern for appearance, etc.[4] Because of this growing sense of independence, both the parents and adolescent should work out a new kind of relationship. This growth makes it imperative for any individual to "wean" himself psychologically from his family. But the process of "weaning" is not easy "because of the normal ambivalence of desire on the part of both parent and child." This is a problem not only for the adolescent but also for the parent. For the adolescent the problem is how to become weaned. But for the parent, it is how to let the child become independent. This problem of "weaning" can not be avoided. "Many a man or woman of forty or fifty is still struggling with an unsolved problem of weaning."[1]

---

[1] Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 55.

[2] Ibid., 34. [3] Ibid., p. 12. [4] Ibid., p. 125.

Adolescence is a time of rapid physical growth, which often causes awkwardness and embarrasment, a new sensitivity, and a certain amount of instability, tension and restlessness and other complicated feelings and adjustments. Elliott writes:

> The adjustments are complicated because the adolescent has both to learn to live with himself or herself as a changed individual at the same time that he or she is making adjustment to a set of new social relationships.[2]

The maturing of sex organs creates recurring internal pressure of sex. The opposite sex no longer appears the same and new adjustments are needed.

Adolsecence is a period of working out one's own

---

1. Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 127.

2. Ibid., pp. 125-126.

moral standards and philosophy of life. Even if there are conflicts between the standards at home and the standards outside one experiences during his childhood, he is likely to be still dominated by the standards of his parents. But it is no longer so. One should work out his own standards. "Working out one's own moral standards and life philosophy is fundamentally involved in the problem of growing up."[1] The adolescent should be fully given the opportunity to explore all different points of view in the process of working out their own philosophy of life and moral standards. Some adolescents do not succeed in working out their own philosophy of life and adopt without questioning the code and beliefs of their companions or father substitutes with whom they keep dependent relationships. This process of working out one's own philosophy is not completed in adolescence, but continues throughout life. In order to express their philosophy of life, adolescents need to find organizations or institutions which support their views and to which they can relate.[2]

During this period of transition, adolescents need encouragement and sympathetic understanding on the part of the parent, helping them to accept their own responsi-

---

1. Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 131.

2. Ibid., p. 135.

bility and to see that in order to attain independence, they need not break relationships with parents, nor lose love and respect for them.[1] Unfortunately, parents often either treat the adolescents like little children or fail to take responsibility for the growth of their children in the name of free education. "Schools and teachers also contribute to adolescent difficulties."[2]

With regard to early maturity, Elliott makes marriage and family his main concern in his disucssion of its central problem during this stage of life. He rather deals with adulthood as a whole and calls it "the last half of life." What should be the major goal during this last half of life? After one grows up physically and reaches maturity, the goal for his next stage is "the completion of a span of activity on which one can look back at the close of a journey with satisfaction and with a sense of completion."[3] The test one will experience during adulthood is whether he has satisfying responsibility and continuous growth until old age, so that he can accept death without fear or sense of frustration, but with readiness and willingness. It is very important for adults to grow continually not at the direction of parents or teachers, but at one's own direction. "He now is able to utilize, in the process, the resources of books and experts and the experience of others."[1] His growth is not limited to the increase of knowledge and skill in the area in which he is mature. At the same time, he has to start new areas in which he is still a child. He should widen his relationships in which he may become competent.

---

[1] Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 133.

[2] Ibid., p. 128.

[3] Ibid., p. 15.

What is maturity? Elliott defines maturity in the following words:

> Maturity then means the bringing of undifferentiated unorganized, unrelated and often conflicting impulses and desires into a definite, organized and functioning whole, where energy is not wasted in superficial satisfactions and where life is not a truce among warring desires, but where those desires are integrated into a growing whole which is enriched by the variety and diversity of its elements. It is thus that dynamics and power are released and augmented to focus on whatever is to be done at a particular time. Maturity in relationships means, likewise, growth from childish identifications, with their compulsive imitations and dependencies, to those relationships where the individual has found and accepted in him and the qualities which he has emulated or resisted in others, and thus developed a self which can build a relationship with other personalities on a growing and constructive basis. . . .Maturity then can never be given to any individual except through his own experience.[2]

Therefore, it is quite possible that some people are more

---

1. Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 12.

2. Ibid., pp. 35-36.

mature at the age of sixteen than others are at the age of sixty. Elliott defines "adult" to be "the individual who can take responsibility for his action, that is, bring the activity to completion."[1] Adults are capable of connecting events and their consequences in spite of a wide gap in time and space because they have wider knowledge, experience and greater development of brain structure. Successful parents are those who bring their "children to a stage of development where they no longer need the protection and care of their parents but are able to meet life for themselves."[2]

The major problem of middle life and of old age, particularly after the age of forty, is to understand the goals and bases of satisfaction for the last half of life.[3] Just as there is no sharp demarcation between childhood and adolescence, there is none from early maturity to middle life, nor from middle life to old age. The problems of middle life and old age are about "the waning of physical powers and the progressive yielding of responsibilities."[4] Those are in good contrast with the problems of adolescent and early maturity which have to

---

1. Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 37.

2. Ibid., p. 224. 3. Ibid., p. 13. 4. Ibid., p. 14.

do with growing physical powers and progressive assumption of responsibilities."[1] The adjustments from middle life onward are just the reverse from those of adolescence and childhood. They are about giving up direct responsibilities to the younger generation, and "learning how to work in and through other people and how to get satisfactions in the achievement of others."[2] In modern society, one is away from home so much that he fails to take time to cultivate the areas of mutual concern and interest with his wife and to widen the area of satisfaction. For woman, middle life brings physical and emotional instability, tension, restlessness, sensitiveness, and irritability, caused by menopause.[3] Both husband and wife need help in understanding the source of difficulties as related to glandular adjustmensts, and the assurance of the possibility of continuing satisfaction in sex life.

Elliott describes old age as "a time of retrospect." "Security becomes of importance comparable to its importance in childhood."[4] The desirability of old age pensions and other provisions to secure reasonable financial independence can be understood from this perspective, i.e., the sense of security in old age. Since one can not find it

---

1. Elliott, Solving Personal Poroblems, 14.
2. Ibid.        3. Ibid., pp. 169-172, 192-195.
4. Ibid., p. 14.

possible to make up for the past mistakes or deficiencies, he has to learn to accept his failures and to gather up his achievements into a sense of completion and fulfillment.

Briefly, Elliott seems to conceive that man's basic needs are both "selfish or egoistic and unselfish or social," though he does not state it distinctively. He sees that each individual is different from others in his "inborn equipment" and growth, and that one grows from the stage of complete dependence upon others to the stage of independence and self-protection, from immaturity to maturity, and that the process of growth is not limited by reaching adulthood.

### 4. Human Knowledge

The purpose of this section is to investigate Elliott's vew of human knowledge; its pertinence to the Christian faith, its function and limitations, and leave its bearing on Christian education to the next chapter and Chapter VII.

It is not clear from Elliott's writings whether his emphasis on God's immanence is based on his view of human knowledge, or vice versa. But one can find a close relationship between the two. In dealing with the problem of the pertinence of human knowledge to the understanding of God's revelation, Elliott traces two typical approaches, which have been in the church since the time of New Testament era. One is the Pauline negation of the pertinence of human knowledge and wisdom to the interpretation of the Gospel; the other is the Johanine incorporation not only of Greek terminology but also the "Greek mind." Furthermore, he points out the significant fact that the Protestant tradition initiated by Luther and Calvin, the pronounced anti-intellectualists, has been on the line of the Pauline approach, whereas the Roman Catholic tradition which has shared the attitude of Origen and Thomas Aquinas has taken the Johanine approach. The modern religious education movement has, on the whole, followed the Catholic tradition rather than the Protestant tradition. On the contrary, the neo-orthodox theologians re-assert "the traditional Protestant position of the irrelevance or the subsidiary importance of human knowledge."[1] Brunner makes a sharp distinction between "natural psychology" and "Biblical Psychology" just as he separates human knowledge and faith, science and religion into two different realms. This is possibly due to Brunner's emphasis on God's transcendence. On the other hand, Elliott permits no clear distinction between the natural and super-natural, the sacred and the secular, "natural psychology" and "Biblical Psychology", because God is immanent. For Elliott, "it is not a satisfactory solution to call a realm which has already been mastered, natural; and a realm which is still unexplored and is therefore mysterious, super-natural."[1] The division into two realms, no matter how they are defined, is not satisfactory because God is immanent in all and through all. All is both natural and supernatural. "As the reverent scientist discovers in the physical universe around him possibilities beyond his understanding. . . he is in the presence of God Himself."[2] The more he learns, the more he becomes a co-worker with God. "God works in and through the same orderly process in the area of religion that He does in other aspects of that universe."[3]

---

[1] Elliott, *Can Religious Education Be Christian?*, p. 124.

Human knowledge comes through human experience; be it knowledge about God, or knowledge about nature. Elliott repudiates the criticism against progressive religious educators that they seek to work out their view of God from human experience, and that they project their own ideas upon God; therefore, their God is a human creation.

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 127.

2. ______, The Bearing of Psychology upon Religion, p. 48.

3. ______, "Reflections of a Religious Educator," Religious Education, Vol. XLV (July-August, 1950), p. 197.

He insists that "whether God is transcendent or immanent or both transcendent and immanent, he is known only through his manifestations in this world and in human history."[1] F. Nile Harper summarizes Elliott's basic assumptions in his approach to "religious education" and the first assumption is "The source of knowledge is human experience past and present."[2] In his concluding chapter of Can Religious Education Be Christian?, Elliott writes:

> All knowledge has grown out of man's experience with nature and with human beings. All the ideas of mankind are conclusions from and interpretations of experience. Science is no exception. It represents a more accurate and more controlled method of experience than that of the man on the street. Scientific interpretations are based upon it. . . . Ethical standards and social arrangements are the product of a long experience process. Mankind has learned in and through its experience.[3]

The knowledge of God is no exception to this principle of learning through experience. "Man's knowledge has grown out of his experience in the world and out of his reflections upon the manifestations of God in nature and in human life."[4] The development of the ideas of God in the Bible from the ancient Hebrew to the New Testament time is the result of the long process of continuing interpretation of God's revelation to his people. It is based on the life experience of God's people. "The interpretations of Jesus Christ are not the creation of the human mind nor direct revelations unrelated to human experience."[1] These interpretations are based on the life of Jesus Christ and have grown out of the life experiences of those individuals who were related to him. Even Paul accepted current human ideas about man in his interpretation of the Gospel. The healing miracle stories in the New Testament are based on the psychological knowledge about demon possession at that time.[2] Therefore, "natural knowledge is of help in understanding the experiences of the Bible. . . ."[3] Human knowledge is needed for the discovery and revision of inadequate or false concepts of man or wrong cosmology. Elliott points out an interesting fact that "the psychologies of the previous generation, which are now changing, were very well suited to the theological beliefs of the time."[4] Here, we can see the importance of human knowledge in understanding the theological beliefs, because they grow out of human experiences.

---

[1] Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 132.

[2] F. Nile Harper, "The Thought and Work of Harrison S. Elliott," p. 61.

[3] Elliott, pp. 310-311.

[4] Ibid., p. 311.

---

[1] Elliott, *Can Religious Education Be Christian?*, p. 311.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 131.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

[4] Elliott, "Shifting Psychologies in Their Bearing on Social Change," *Religious Education*, Vol. XXV (June, 1930), p. 555.

One's knowledge of God comes out of his life experience and "every individual looks at a situation through the glasses of his past experience; and no two individuals wear the same glasses, since all have different experiences."[1] It is clear that "no human being can fully discover or interpret the meaning of God," and that "there are within the Bible and within Christian history many diverse interpretations of Jesus Christ," and that there is no single authoritative interpreation of the Christian faith in the New Testament which is normative for today.[2]

With regard to human knowledge, Elliott points out the danger of equating science with religion. Scientists tend to present not only their findings but their interpretations of the meaning of their findings for human life as to the meaning and purpose of life and draw conclusions to the ultimate questions with which theology must deal. "Data must be taken into account in making the philosophical interpretations," but data do not prove them. Furthermore, scientists limit their works in a special area. "Science can never become the authority of religion." The limitation of science can

---

1. Elliott, "Individual and Group Counseling," Orientation in Religious Education, edited by Philip H. Lots, (1950) p. 184.

2. ______, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 112.

also be seen in the fact that "science does not create any of the forces or resources upon which" it depends.[1] Scientists can only discover and utilizes these forces or resources.

Briefly, Elliott sees that human knowledge is pertinent to the understanding and interpretation of the Christian faith, and that human knowledge comes out of human experience past and present; be it knowledge about God or knowledge about nature, because Elliott's epistemology is essentially anthropocentric.

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 137.

# CHAPTER IV

## ELLIOTT'S PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Having set forth Elliott's view of man, we now turn to his philosophy of Christian education, particularly his ideas about freedom and authority in Christian education, objectives and content of Christian education, teaching methods and learning theory. These are indispensible components for any philosophy of Christian education, particularly in the design of a curriculum.[1]

### 1. Freedom and Authority

The importance of the issue of freedom and authority in any philosophy of education, Christian or otherwise, can not easily be over-estimated. It is important because it leads so often to political struggles as well as to contrasting philosophies of Christian education.[2] It is also an important issue in general education as John Dewey points out:

---

[1] See, Design for Methodist Curriculum, a statement of the Curriculum Committee, General Board of Education, The Methodist Church, published by Graded Press, the curriculum publishing department of The Methodist Publishing House, (1965). Also see, Design for the the Curriculum of the Church's Educational Ministry of the Cooperative Curriculum Project.

[2] Lawrence C. Little, Foundations of a Philosophy of Christian Education, p. 20.

> The last four centuries have displayed an ever-increasing revolt against authority,
>
> . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
>
> The genuine problem is the relation between authority and freedom. . . . authority stands for stability of social organization by means of which direction and support are given to individuals; while individual freedom stands for the forces by which change is intentionally brought about. The issue that requires constant attention is the intimate and organic union of the two things: of authority and freedom, of stability and change.[1]

What is Elliott's view of freedom and authority? In his defense of "modern religious education" against the attack by the neo-orthodox interpreters for going astray from the Reformation, he analyzes the issue of freedom and authority thoroughly from historical and theological points of view.

Historically, in order to prevent the development and spread of heresy, the early church fathers gradually established the basis of authority to combat heresies. The question of heresy was dealt with by establishing an authoritative interpretation of the Christian faith which carried the authority of the apostles' authorship. In refutation of the Marcion heresy, the source of appeal was not only the apostolic writings but also the apos-

---

1. John Dewey, Philosophy of Education, Totowa, N.J.: Littlefield, Adams & Co., (1966), pp. 93-94.

tolic tradition. But, even "an authoritative creedal formulation of the interpretations in the authoritative apostolic writings did not prove sufficient to meet the problem."[1] So, the living voice of the bishops became another basis for appeal. The living voice of the bishops still did not prove sufficient to face the problem because bishops themselves often differed in opinion. Consequently the authority of councils was added and "a four-fold basis of authority" grew up in the church to meet the problem of heresy and disputation. In spite of this four-fold system of authority, "it did not prevent basic differences of interpretation within the church."[2] Drawing upon his major sources for tracing back the establishment of authority within the church, Elliott points out that "the Reformation itself was one of these heretical developments which has persisted down to the present time," and that "the Reformers went back to the original source of authority of the second century and started" again the development of authority.[3]

But the cardinal principle at the Reformation time, as Elliott understands it, is "the right of the private

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 82.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 83.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 83.

interpretation of the Bible"; "the people should be able to read the Bible for themselves."[1] It was emphasized that every Christian should be free to test any interpretation of the Christian faith for himself. Instead of the external four-fold system of authority, the Reformers emphasized the internal authority within each person, the freedom of every individual Christian with regard to the faith he would accept. This emphasis opens the way for the use of the educational approach in the process of formulating one's beliefs. The cardinal principle of the Reformation gives support to the modern "religious education movement" which was influenced by progressive education, and which emphasizes the liberty of the individual. Therefore, the modern "religious education" approach is not in conflict with the original spirit of the Reformation.

The authoritarian doctrinal emphasis was a later development because of the controversies among the Reformers. Luther abandoned his original principle that every Christian has the right to interpret the Christian faith and to test any doctrine for himself and emphasized more and more the interpretations which to him had the support of the Bible. What became "authoritative" was the sound doctrine formulated by the true church. Zwingli's emphasis on the Divine Will as revealed in the Scriptures contributed to the authoritarian doctrinal emphasis of later Protestantism. Furthermore, during the second period of the Reformation, each prince should decide between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism and the result was the substitution of a new form of church authority over both religious and civil affairs. Consequently, an authoritarian approach to education gradually developed in the church to support the authoritarian interpretation of the Christian faith and the practice of the church.[1]

---

[1] Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 12.

This influenced the Sunday School in the United States, which carried on the authoritarian tradition derived from the Reformation. This authoritarian emphasis was prominent in the colonial period in America. It was the purpose of the Sunday School to indoctrinate the authoritative interpretation of the Bible and the Christian faith of a particular denomination. In order to indoctrinate the correct doctrine, the Bible and catechism were the chief curriculum materials, and the method of teaching was mainly catechetical instruction. Memorization of Bible verses and the catechetism was greatly emphasized. "The graded lessons did not fundamentally challenge the authoritarian Biblical approach and emphasis which had

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, pp. 13-16.

characterized Protestant religious education" of the last century.[1] The Herbartian method which consists of steps to achieve the pre-determined goals suited for teaching authoritarian doctrines was commonly used.

A fundamental criticism of the authoritarian educational approach has developed during this century through the progressive education movement, which originated outside the church, and which has been influenced by Pestalozzi, who received his inspiration from Rousseau's Emile, whose key concept challenged the traditional idea of education. For him, education is "a drawing out instead of a pouring in," and teaching must start from the concrete and move to the abstract. Brutal discipline was opposed. Modern "religious education" is part of progressive education, which has received severe attacks from neo-orthodox Christian educators such as Shelton Smith and E. G. Homrighausen,[2] who re-affirm the authoritarian educational approach, based on neo-orthodox theology, which emphasizes the direct revelation of God and His sovereignty. For them, education is a method to appropriate God's revelation, the predetermined content. But from Elliott's point of view, education is more than a method to be utilized and submitted to the authority of a particular interpretation of God's revelation. He is convinced

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 39.
2. Ibid., pp. 68-69.

that:

> There has not been any single, clearly defined interpretation of the Christian faith in any period of Christian history. Christianity has been distinctive in the diversity of its interpretation.[1]

The church has never been successful in establishing a single authoritative interpretation by way of external control. The function of "religious education" in the reconstruction and enrichment of the Christian faith should be recongnized, because "for Elliott authority is in the process of intelligent interpretation of human experience."[2] In contrast to neo-orthodox Christian educators, Elliott re-affirms the cardinal principle of the early Reformation rather than the later development of the Reformation, i.e., the authoritarian doctrinal approach. Authority is found not in objective reality, but in subjective experience. It implicitly resides in personal religious experience. This can be seen in Elliott's emphasis on life situations as the necessary focus of religion rather than the Bible itself. As F. Nile Harper points out in his study, Elliott did assert by 1940 that authority is in the experiential process itself.[3] In concluding his argument of the insufficiency of neo-orthodoxy as a foundation for Christian education and the sufficiency of progressive "religious education" to be Christian, Elliott writes:

---

[1] Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 86.

[2] Harper, "The Thought and Work of . . ." p. 260.

[3] Op.cit., p. 313. Also see, Harper, p. 264.

> The source of authority for the Christian is in that educational process which is guided by Christian purposes and is grounded on the Christian confidence.[1]

Christian education should not be the means for the propagation of an authoritative faith. "When religion is taught on an authoritarian basis, as is assumed in the neo-orthodox type of religious education," children and young people tend to be prevented from having a vital experience of their own.[2]

Against the neo-orthodox type of authoritarian theology which has a strong emphasis on God's sovereignty and human obedience, and which has become the basis for an authoritarian educational approach, Elliott questions the possibility of God's direct ruling and points out the danger of identifying God's sovereignty with human sovereignty. "The personal will of God becomes identified with the will of man."[3] Thus, a theological basis is given for an authoritarian home, school, and state. What man has, in fact, is not the direct reign of God, but the

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 320.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 315. 3. *Ibid.*, p. 153.

authority of parents, teachers, ministers, and rulers. "The will of God in the home is the parents' will."[1] Authoritarian "religious education" uses God for the sanction of its interpretations of the Christian faith. So often in the past, human right and scientific advance have been opposed in the name of God, and on the authority of God. Elliott writes:

> A sovereign God inevitably becomes associated with sovereign men. The denial of the right of the individual to assert himself before God is usually accompanied by a denial of his rights before the authority of men. Human initiative and responsibility are fundamentally threatened because in practice the individual is made to feel that when he questions the authority of parents and teachers and ministers he is in fact questioning the authority of God.[2]

Furthermore, the cultural situation should be taken into account. Elliott quotes from Paul Tillich's personal experience in his struggle to affirm his mental and moral autonomy from his father's authority in German culture. He warns "religious educators" not to read into the American scene the problems which grow out of the German Lutheran and particularly the Reformed background, which is typically authoritarian. In a democratic society, the children's independence tends to be encouraged and developed; they are encouraged to do their own thinking and to win for themselves a growing sense of autonomy. When they come to the stage of adolescence, they will not have such a critical struggle with authority for independence. On the contrary, Elliott sees the problems of American youth as unique in the sense of not rebelling against the authority but rather seeking authority which they do not have. He writes:

---

[1] Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 153.

[2] Ibid., pp. 153-154.

> The problems for thousands of American youth is that they have had too little rather than too much authority. Their parents are confused and baffled by the present situation in the world and they have left their children to find their way without the security and the guidance which relationship with parents and home and other adults should give as the basis for a true autonomy. As a result, they are in danger of being as badly lost as their parents. They are the ones who, instead of seeking autonomy against the authority of adults, are looking for some anchorage, some authority in which they can trust.[1]

Elliott warns his fellow leaders of "religious education" not to make a false diagnosis of the problems of youth in America because of the influence of European theology.

Why does Elliott find "any thing smacking of authoritarianism" abhorent? Why does he castigate the traditional Protestant view so consistently in his book? David William Jewell seems to assume that it is due to the fact that "by 1940 in America and in the milieu of Union Theological Seminary the term would have extremely strong negative overtones."[1]

---

[1] Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 166.

Briefly, Elliott sees that "all dogmatism is logically and religiously wrong,"[2] because he emphasizes the cardinal principle of the Reformation, i.e., "the right of the private interpretation of the Bible," the freedom of each individual, and internal authority. He negates any single, clearly defined, authoritative interpretation of the Christian faith because for him authority is found in the process of interpretation of human experience.

### 2. Objectives of Christian Education

The purpose of this section is to investigate Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education, because they show the direction toward which the educational process should proceed and also the bases for evaluation of its results. Therefore, an examination of objectives is an important task in finding one's philosophy of Christian education.

---

[1] Jewell, "Aspects of Authority. . .," p. 97.

[2] George A. Coe, "On Life, Work and Influence," Religious Education, Vol. XLVI (1951), p. 264.

Elliott does not spell out his objectives of Christian education into lengthy statements with a clear set of goals to be achieved. Rather he inter-mingles them with his argument in defence of progressive "religious education" against neo-orthodox interpreters. There is no chapter entitled "Objectives of Religious Education" as such. But in his comparison of traditional authoritarian approaches and the progressive approach from the historical point of view, the difference in objectives is made clear and his argument procedes step by step toward the contemporary scene. He rarely states his objectives of Christian education in an emphatic confessional or credal form beginning with words: "I believe the objective of Christian education to be. . ." His contrast of two different approaches to Christian education is made rather objectively without much clear identification of his own position. But his position can be clearly detected in spite of his objectivity in writing.

Right from the outset of his presentation of the conflict which he deals with in his dissertation, which was published later as a book, *Can Religious Education Be Christian?*, Elliott points out that the controlling purpose of the Sunday School of the authoritarian tradition has been "to ground children in those interpretations of the Bible and of the Christian religion on which the particular denomination believed that salvation depended."[1] Its controlling purpose is also stated as "to make the doctrinal message of the Bible known to children and youth."[2] The educational aim is the transmission of a pre-determined set of Christian doctrine, a particular kind of interpretation of the Christian faith. The objective of this authoritarian approach is to transmit the subject-matter determined by the teacher. This kind of teaching aims at "the conversion at the age of accountability," rather than the "nurture of Christian life and conduct either before or after conversion." In order to obtain a conversion experience, children are shown "their lost condition" and are led to "accept the saving work of Christ."

This type of objective was challenged by Horace Bushnell near the middle of nineteenth century. "He objected to the assumption that the Spirit of the Lord was especially present in revivals as compared with other periods in the life of individuals and of the church."[3] His challenge is based on his concept of God who "is omnipresent and working in various ways," and on his criticism against the over-emphasis on conversion and lack of cultivation of the Christian life.[4]

---

[1] Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 23.

[2] Ibid., p. 25. [3] Ibid., p. 27. [4] Ibid.

In spite of the challenge of Horace Bushnell and his followers, the objectives of the authoritarian educational approach were re-affirmed by the Committee on the State of the Church as it was apparent in its report to the 1938 biennial meeting of the Federal Council of Churches.[1] It was to utilize the pedagogical techniques for the mediation of an authoritarian interpretation of the Christian faith. Its starting point was "the great realities of the Christian religion." The content was predetermined.

Elliott strongly repudiates this kind of objective for the educational process. What then is Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education? In contrast to the authoritarian objective, the Committee on Basic Philosophy and Policies made explicit to the International Council of Religious Education in 1940 that:

> the function of religious education is not simply the transmission of an authoritarian interpretation of the Christian religion, but the reinterpretation and enrichment of the Christian faith itself in and through an educational process.[2]

The transmission of a culture, a body of knowledge, or a set of doctrines should be used not only "to develop persons fitted in character and ability to deal with new situations" but also to add to the resources of the race. The educational objective is the learner's encounter with historic culture and present living in which the "accumulated traditions of the past" undergoes "retesting, re-appraisal, and reconstruction in the light of expanding experience" as well as the contemporary living experience. It is to reinterpret the Christian faith for oneself in terms of the living experience of his own day. It is to use historic symbols "without being bound by them and to free those who will come after us to explore the depths and heights of Christian faith which belongs to the centuries" and which man can not fully explore.[1] The emphasis of this objective is upon the "reinterpretation and the enrichment of that faith in any historic period." It is not upon the formulation of "certain fixed and authoritative beliefs at which the process of religious education must arrive."[2] It is not based on any particular theological position. These are objectives with which Elliott could identify and to which he gives support.[3] His support for the International Council of Religious Education can be detected by his use

---

[1] Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 63.

[2] Ibid., p. 64.

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 65.

2. Ibid., p. 66.

3. Moore, "Christian Education in the Light. . ." pp. 215-216, and Jones, "The Place of God. . ." p. 262.

of an adjective phrase, "representing forty one denominations," which would add weight to the statement its Educational Committee made about educational objectives.[1] Elliott's view on educational objectives can be seen clearly in the following:

> For the religious educator, this Christian heritage represents a process of both adaptation and growth. As Christianity has come into contact with diverse conditions and new knowledge, it has itself undergone both reinterpretation and enrichment. Religious education which is Christian is a part of this century-long process. . . .Religious education therefore is not an education with fixed and predetermined content. There is no one true interpretation of the Christian religion which it is its function to transmit. Rather, religious education is an enterprise in which historical experiences and conceptions are utilized in a process by which individuals and groups come to experiences and convictions which are meaningful for them today.[2]

Walter Lawrence Nyberg made a general study of several leading Christian educators in order to determine what should be the key themes for a comparative study. In his summary of Elliott's view, one can find his ninth point questionable. It says, "Religious education must be concerned about the application of Christian teachings to social and ethical concerns."[3] The basis for questioning is on his use of word, "application," which

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 64.

2. Ibid., p. 310.

3. Nyberg, "A Comparative Study of Key. . . ," p. 47.

presupposes a fixed, or predetermined interpretation of the Christian faith and the use of Herbartian method, which are not meant by Elliott. The educational objective, for Elliott, is the reinterpretation and enrichment of the Christian faith by the individuals and groups for meaningful experiences for their own day.

Elliott's basic educational objective can also be seen from his statement about the goal of counseling and successful parenthood and teaching in one of his earlier writings. He writes:

> The goal of counseling, as of any other educational process, is maturity. Successful parenthood involves bringing one's children to a stage of development where they no longer need protection and care of their parents but are able to meet life for themselves. Successful teaching results in the student's gaining that degree of mastery and responsibility at which he can carry on further study and development without the direction of the teacher. Successful teaching of morals or religion guides the individual to that degree of attainment where he possesses within himself the ability to make moral decisions and the religious belief and experience by which life is guided and inspired.[1]

Another important aspect in Elliott's educational objective is its "social" emphasis. He pays great attention to maturity, man's meeting emergencies on a rational basis,[1] yet he holds "that a religious education that is too intellectual is not a good education: It concentrates on the mind but does not train the emotions."[2] Elliott's conception of education has a wider view than that of mind alone. He sees the importance of emotion. "A human problem is never solely an intellectual affair and thinking about it is always emotional." He sees the danger of education which is merely intellectually oriented. Elliott writes:

---

[1] Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 224. Also see, Elliott, "Individual and Group Counseling," Orientation in Religious Education edited by Lotz, p. 183. Elliott, "Shifting Psychologies in Their Bearing on Social Change," Religious Education, Vol. XXV (1930), p. 216.

> An education which has been centered on intellectual training was bound to be ineffective because the more the intellect was developed out of relation to the emotions, the greater was the likelihood of conflict and disharmony within the personality.[3]

Elliott's concern for emotional education is related to his emphasis on social reconstruction, the realization of God's kingdom on earth, as the goal of educational process and his social strategy in education. He writes:

> The very essence of an educational process is comradeship between the more mature and the less mature in the enterprises of life where there are goals beyond the private welfare of individuals in which that welfare is involved.[4]

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian? p. 216.

2. Jones, "The Place of God in the Educative. . . ," P. 297.

3. Elliott, p. 205.

4. Ibid., p. 159.

He knows the weakness of individualistic approach--how easily each individual is influenced and conditioned by the social environment; he also knows the strength of the social approach. The business of education is to "attack the problem by using intelligence in such social arrangements as make possible goals in which both the self and others are included."[1] He aims at a "co-operative society in which love is more genuinely operative," because "in the last analysis, love as an ideal becomes a dynamic for living only as it is experienced."[2] This social goal would provide the basis for the co-operation between religious educators and general educators whose objective is the democratic society.

This social emphasis is essential for the "vital experience of God."[3] From his study of Elliott, David Kyle Almon points out:

> In a social process of religious education there is an integral relationship between the kingdom of God and the efforts of Christians in the remaking of human life and also between the experience of God and the endeavor of human beings to make the love of God explicit in human affairs.[4]

---

[1] Ellliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 209.

[2] Ibid., p. 246.

[3] Ibid., p. 280.

[4] David Kyle Almon, "Personalism in Religious Education," (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Boston University, 1944), p. 119.

Briefly, Elliott conceives the educational objectives to be the reinterpretation and enrichment of the Christian faith in and through the educational process by which individuals and groups come to experiences and convictions which are meaningful for them today. He also stresses the social goal, aiming at a "co-operative society in which love is genuinely operative."

### 3. Content of Christian Education

The issue about the content of Christian education does not stand alone. It is always related to the problem of authority and freedom in education, the interpretation of the Christian faith, and the objectives of the educational process.

Since for Elliott the source of authority does not exist externally, but internally within each individual; since there has never been a clearly defined authoritative interpretation of the Christian faith acceptable to all; and since the educational objective is the reinterpretation and enrichment of the Christian faith by individuals and groups for themselves, the content of Christian education is not a pre-fixed authoritarian interpretation of the Christian faith. The content should be what enables all individuals and groups to come to their own interpretations of the Christian faith. In this emphasis, Elliott does not assume that "individuals or groups would work out their Christian beliefs in a vacuum, as if there had been no Christian history."[1] Therefore, the individuals or groups must utilize the Scriptures, historic experiences and convictions to the full not as the authority for the Christian faith but as a resource, "along with all other available resources for the development of their own experience and beliefs."[2] Elliott is quite aware of the historical continuity of the Christian faith. This awareness is expressed in his emphasis that "religious education which is Christian can not be unmindful of these historical interpretations."[3] Christianity today is the product of a long history with its traditions and spiritual heritages. Therefore, he writes:

> Present experience can not be dissociated from the traditions of historic experience without distortion, nor neglect the great Christian heritage without becoming superficial.[4]

Elliott is liberal, but he is not radical to the extent of denying that the "Christ of experience" should have vital connection with the "Jesus of history." From this point of view, historical criticism is an important part

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 88.

2. Moore, "Christian Education in the Light of Three Theological Views of Man," p. 26.

3. Elliott, p. 309.        4. Ibid.

of the resources for Christian education. His concern for the historical Jesus is evident in his writings, particularly in his description of the historical background of Jesus.[1] Elliott regards the New Testament writings as "the record of the living experience of individuals and of the early church.". "The interpretations therein contained represent efforts to make clear the meaning and significance of those experiences."[2] They are not the direct revelation of God. It is the objectives of Christian education that in every generation Christians find for themselves the meaning of the experience of Jesus Christ and the interpretation of the Christian faith true to their own experience and relevant to their living situations. It seems to Elliott that for this to happen, persons must reflect earnestly "upon the problems and upon the experience which individuals and the churches had realized in their relation to Jesus Christ."[3] Therefore, they must utilize the Scriptures and other resources related to problems, experiences and reflections of Christians in the past.

In his emphasis on non-authoritarian education, Elliott does not prohibit teachers, parents, ministers, and other adults from sharing with children and youth their personal religious convictions and beliefs. He is aware that one can not reflect in a vacuum, nor work out his own interpretation of the Christian faith out of nothing. On the one hand, "historical experience and convictions would be utilized to the full in the educational process"; and on the other, "neither is there thought that parents, teachers, and other adults must withhold all testimony to faith which is to them vital and by which they live their lives."[1] The testimony of teachers and parents is essential to the educational process. But it should be cautioned that they must not give their testimony as authoritarian truth which is final and, therefore, is to be accepted without question. Personal convictions and beliefs of teachers and parents are part of the content of Christian education.

---

[1] Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, pp. 98-100.

[2] Ibid., pp. 111-112. [3] Ibid., p. 112.

There is another factor in Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education which guides and even determines the range of its content. It is the emphasis on social goals in realizing the kingdom of God on earth, in a society in which Christian love is genuinely operative. It is evident that the content will not only be oriented intellectually but also emotionally, seeking for cooperative relationships rather than developing a devastating type of competitive social order. Elliott is as critical as Reinhold Niebuhr of education which is over intellectual with exclusive attention to the training of the mind and no concern for emotional education. For him, it is a wrong assumption that "by the development of intelligence through education the basic impulses and emotions of mankind could be controlled and directed."[1]

---

[1] Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 89.

He also sees the devastating result of an individualistic education which does not produce men of co-operative enterprise, but men of self-assertion and competition. "Thus education of this type has tended to accentuate rather than solve the human problem."[2] With a social view, Elliott proposes the type of education in which content contains social experience aiming for possible goals "in which both the self and others are included."[3] He suggests the plan should be "to organize a school class around enterprises in which both teacher and pupils are involved, in which individuals are respected and have chances proportionate to their ability."[4]

The controlling power is the welfare of the class as a whole, and not the individual pupil nor the teacher. It is beyond one's self, but each individual has made it his

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 205.

2. Ibid., p. 206. 3. Ibid., p. 209.

4. Ibid.

own. The content contains "group enterprises to which all may contribute and in which all are needed," so that the attention of each individual is not on himself alone but on group success, a social goal. For the realization of this social goal, which involves oneself and others, the life situation for both the individual and the social group should be the major element of the content of educational enterprises. In this regard, Elliott writes:

> Christian ethics is to be utilized in the educational process, not only as a guide to individual practice but also as the critique of established group practices and as a criterion for the reconstruction of group life.[1]

F. Nile Harper found that Elliott's emphasis on life situations came in the decade of 1910 to 1920 when he found John Dewey's analysis of thinking as experimental problem-solving which could be utilized in Christian education. "Life situations provided the problems which could be solved experimentally and the Bible became a resource for personal problem-solving."[2]

Briefly, Elliott sees that the content of Christian education is not any pre-fixed authoritative dogma to be accepted without questioning. It includes the Scriptures, historic experiences and convictions of individual Chris-

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 246.

2. Harper, "The Thought and Work of Harrison S. Elliott," p. 257.

tians and the churches, the testimonies of present day Christians, life situations and social experiences of both the individual and the social group.

### 4. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory

In analyzing Elliott's philosophy of Christian education, it is imperative that we examine his views on teaching methods and learning theory. What teaching methods does Elliott advocate and on what ground does he advocate them?

In his chapter entitled "An Educational Approach" in Can Religious Education Be Christian?, Elliott makes a brief survey of educational theories in the past and their bearings on Protestant "religious education," particularly the development of the liberal wing to which he gives support. Elliott's view on teaching methods developed out of his personal experiences as he was working with young people in the Y.M.C.A. in the early part of this century. With the coming of World War I, he had to face a new task in ministering to the needs of servicemen. The challenge during these war years led him to experiment with the life situation approach in education.[1] He was dissatisfied with the Herbartian method which was centered on subject-matter, aiming "to supplement information already possessed and to present new information,"[1] and which was suited for teaching the authoritarian interpretations of the Christian faith. The main emphasis of the Herbartian method is on "determining the principles" and their application to practical situations. It is based on the assumption that "subject matter is something which exists apart from the persons who are to use it."[2] It seems to Elliott that this dualism is false. Perhaps from his personal experience with those who were vexed with complicated problems during War times, it became increasingly difficult to trust principles "as unmistakable guides to conduct" as the situation got more complicated. There are exceedingly complicated situations in which the straight forward Herbartian five steps, preparation, presentation, comparison, generalization and application, would not work. In the Herbartian method, the goal is pre-determined, and is stated in terms of a conclusion.

---

[1] Harper, "The Thought and Work of Harrison S. Elliott," p. 57.

The turning point for Elliott was his contact with John Dewey's book, *How We Think* and other significant studies from which he developed the group thinking approach in the problem solving process, and published his pioneering book in group dynamics, The Process of Group Thinking. Gradually he came to realize more fully the "exploratory thought processes available to mankind" in solving problems. He found these thought processes to be trustworthy if they are sincerely and thoroughly utilized. This group thinking process is a democratic process. He was quite sure that this is the "best way to grow men and women. It is he who does the thinking, who does the problems, who makes the plans, who alone achieves both growth and happiness."[1] It is through this process that the group can make up its mind as a group. Group thinking is a methodology for securing democratic participation. It is through group thinking processes that man's ability to be an independent self-directing person is cultivated as an individual and as a group. It provides the most favorable condition for human possibilities to be actualized.[2] Yet Elliott was also aware of the limitations of this process, because it depends on individual members and there are crises and particular issues which can not be discussed in public.[3]

---

[1] Elliott, *Can Religious Education Be Christian?*, p. 38. Also see, Elliott, "Reflection of a Religious Educator," *Religious Education*, Vol. XLV (1950), p. 197.

[2] Elliott, *Can Religious Education Be Christian?*, p. 39.

Unlike the Herbartian method, the group thinking

---

1. Elliott, The Process of Group Thinking, p. 6.

2. Ibid., p. 12. 3. Ibid., pp. 18-21.

process does not have pre-determined goals; rather it's goal is stated in terms of something which is to be sought and found out. In the Herbartian procedure the subject matter is often presented in general terms without any particular relevance to actual situations. But in the group thinking process, the subject matter usually is part and parcel of the life situation.[1] The dualism of subject matter and life experience is overcome. "A question for discussion always represents a problem in a setting. . . . A problem must always be considered as it manifests itself to the particular group facing it."[2] Elliott found Gestalt psychology very valuable in this regard. Its theory affirms that "the response is to a complex situation composed of the focal stimulus in the perspective of its particular setting."[3] He emphasizes that principles "grow out of experience and have meaning only in relation to experience"; therefore, it seems to him that "constructive discussion takes place only as the specific situation is faced on the basis of the underlying differences of fact and conviction."[4] Furthermore, the underlying differences should be understood and discussed in terms of their meaning in that concrete situation. Principles do change when they become irrelevant to new situations. This situation emphasis characterizes the group thinking process.

---

[1] Elliott, The Process of Group Thinking, p. 36.

[2] Ibid., pp. 42-43.

[3] Ibid., p. 43.

[4] Ibid., p. 57.

Elliott does not neglect nor deny the value of the lecture method, although he greatly emphasizes the group thinking process. He writes:

> Lectures may be a fruitful and dynamic part of group thinking. In a complete group thinking process, a lecture is built into the group thinking and is followed by discussion.[1]

It is very significant that Elliott also points out the fact that individuals differ in degree and type of emotion and that the decision of the group is not trustful "when either the intellectual or the emotional element predominates," because "feeling is not something added. . . at the close of a thought process but is an integral part of every stage of thinking."[2] In the group thinking process, it is vitally important to achieve "frankness in an atmosphere of good will."[3] If the real attitudes and convictions are concealed, any conclusion would not be based on reality.

With regard to essential conditions for creative discussion, Elliott writes:

1) There should be something to be discussed. . .

---

1. Elliott, The Process of Group Thinking, p. 137.

2. Ibid., pp. 148-149. 3. Ibid., p. 173.

> the question must be one pertinent to the life of the group and of real concern to the group members.
> 2) An earnest desire on the part of the group to find an answer to the question, and a willingness to work with others in the group in seeking to arrive at a solution.
> 3) All the parties who are involved in the question shall be present in the discussion.
> 4) Some common interest or concern which binds the group together. . . .[1]

Creative discussion comes out of the fellowship of persons with concerns in the same areas of life but have varying attitudes, convictions, and experiences. Such a fellowship demands mutual respect, an attempt to understand the point of view of other persons, and an effort to find an agreeable solution. "This creative result will take place in proportion as the group has reached in its discussions the spirit of worship,"[2] which means that the group is earnestly seeking to discover the highest and best for which the group is willing to show its supreme commitment and loyalty. The climax of group process is the moment when:

> there comes insight as to what to do, and strength and ability to carry out the purposes, which represent more than the mathematical total of the resources of the members of the group when taken separately.

---

1. Elliott, The Process of Group Thinking, pp. 179-180.

2. Ibid., p. 185. Also see, Elliott, "The Relation of Discussion to Worship," Religious Education, Vol. XX (1925), pp. 352-353.

> Such release of spiritual power is a manifestation of the divine resources all around us which are at the command of all those who in a group process meet the conditions of spiritual creativity.[1]

With regard to group method, it needs to be pointed out that Elliott regards it to be more economical and often more effective than individual counseling.[2] But he does not deny the validity and necessity for help in solving personal problems.

The basic principles which underlie Elliott's method of teaching can be seen from his suggested changes the church should make in regard to the use of educational process in considering ethical issues,[3] and they are: 1) to center in the actual situation rather than the study of principles, 2) to consider all of the alternatives for action, 3) to deal fairly with those alternatives which may be considered undesirable, 4) to be honest and accurate in dealing with the facts, 5) to focus on finding that which is most in line with Christian ethics, 6) to examine critically Christian ethics itself, 7) to put decision into practice, 8) to compare and to evaluate the results of action on the basis of Christian ethics. The similar principles can also be found in Elliott's

---

1. Elliott, The Process of Group Thinking, p. 187.

2. ______, Solving Personal Problems, p. 9.

3. ______, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, pp. 251-260.

other writings on educational strategies and curriculum materials.[1] In his article, "Some Principles to Guide in the Production of Bible Study Course for Voluntary groups," a writing back in 1912, Elliott emphasized the need 1) to relate courses directly to present day problems, 2) to produce courses in the laboratory rather than in the library, 3) to stimulate and guide thought and discussion rather than to state conclusions, 4) to guide the student in using the Bible in search of the Christian solution to life problems, 5) to make courses both social and individual in their impli[illegible] 6) to lead the scientific approach to the pr[illegible] 7) to lead to practical and feasib[illegible] by individuals and groups, 8) to m[illegible] the sense that they assume and [illegible] 9) to make other writings on educational strategies and curriculum materials.[1] In his article, "Some Principles to Guide in the Production of Bible Study Course for Voluntary groups," a writing back in 1912, Elliott emphasized the need 1) to relate courses directly to present day problems, 2) to produce courses in the laboratory rather than in the library, 3) to stimulate and guide thought and discussion rather than to state conclusions, 4) to guide the student in using the Bible in search of the Christian solution to life problems, 5) to make courses both social and individual in their implications, 6) to lead the scientific approach to the problems discussed, 7) to lead to practical and feasible programs of service by individuals and groups, 8) to make courses religious in the sense that they assume and apply spiritual forces, 9) to make

---

[1] Elliott, How J[illegible]ns, (New York: Association Press, [illegible] be disappointed if he wants to fi[illegible] treatment by Elliott on the subject. The [illegible]tains chapter titles, Biblical passages, suggestions and questions for stimulating thinking and discussion.

______, "Professional Curriculum for Union Theological Seminary," a typescript written by Elliott, April 1925 which appears in the appendix of Harper's dissertation.

______, "Religion in the Educational Experiences of Children and Youth," *Religious Education,* Vol. XXXVI (1941), pp. 195-212.

______, "Suggested Syllabus on Religion in Higher Education," Chicago: Religious Education Association, (1942). Reprinted from *Religious Education*, Jan., 1942. This also takes the form of questions.

---

1. Elliott, How Jesus Met Life Questions, (New York: Association Press, 1924), One would be disappointed if he wants to find a systematic treatment by Elliott on the subject. The book contains chapter titles, Biblical passages, suggestions and questions for stimulating thinking and discussion.

   _______, "Professional Curriculum for Union Theological Seminary," a typescript written by Elliott, April 1925 which appears in the appendix of Harper's dissertation.

   _______, "Religion in the Educational Experiences of Children and Youth," Religious Education, Vol. XXXVI (1941), pp. 195-212.

   _______, "Suggested Syllabus on Religion in Higher Education," Chicago: Religious Education Association, (1942). Reprinted from Religious Education, Jan., 1942. This also takes the form of questions.

courses in text form according to the latest educational principles of curriculum construction.[1]

From Elliott's point of view, the basic concern in the educational process is its rootage in life situation, concreteness and specificity, the utilization of the Bible and Christian heritage as resources and not as authoritarian principles, and the eager participation, sincere involvment, and responsible decision and action on the part of the learners. The emphasis on life situations is the key note. Elliott was critical of weekday "religious education" because it was integrally related neither to children's life in the school nor their life in the church. He says, "If religious education is to be effective, it must be integrally a part of the life and experience of a Christian group, such as may be found in a home or a church."[2]

In order to achieve the social goal, the social strategy of education in the realization of God's kingdom on earth needs to be initiated first from the primary groups such as the family, the church, and other immediate

---

1. Elliott, "Some Principles to Guide in the Production of Bible Study Course for Voluntary Groups," a typewritten manuscript by Elliott in 1912 for the Committee on Voluntary Bible Study Curriculum, Y.M.C.A. which appears in the Appendix of F. Nile Harper's dissertation.

2. Elliott, "Are Weekday Church Schools the Solution?" International Journal of Religious Education, Vol. XVII (1940), p. 9.

groups with which the individuals come in contact, then gradually transform the larger society, aiming at its reconstruction.[1]

The next question in relation to Elliott's view on teaching methods is his view on human learning; the former is based on the latter, as Major J. Jones writes:

> Elliott approaches the educational process from the point of the learning process; he deals with the conditions which make learning possible and with the external and social situations that determine to a large measure what is learned. He is concerned with the perfection of teaching materials so as to assure effective and permanent learning.[2]

What then is Elliott's view of human learning? His axiomatic phrase with regard to human learning is "in and through experiences."[3] His theory of learning places great emphasis on the conditioning power of the social environment and at the same time, he sees the great possibility of unlearning through reconditioning.[4] Elliott regards the Christian education of adults as the strategic educational problem. "Adults and the more mature set the circumstances in which children and the immature have their experiences."[5] In

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, pp. 227-228.

2. Major J. Jones, "The Place of God in the. . .," p. 273.

3. Op. cit., pp. 211, 310, 312.

4. Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 97.

5. ______, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 226.

his Solving Personal Problems, there is a sentence which seems to be contradictory to his axiomatic phrase.

> Many of the attitudes and responses described in the early part of the chapter, it may be noted, resulted not from experiences but from attitudes of parents. Little children uninfluenced by points of view other than their own make no distinctions regarding other races.[1]

But in fact, there is no contradiction between the two, if it is taken from what the author is trying to convey, and not from a literalistic point of view. The influence of parents' attitudes on children is part of the experience children have. "In and through their social experience" individuals learn and are influenced, whether their social experience is in their home, school, church, or larger social relationships. His axiomatic phrase, "learning in and through experience" is not something newly invented by progressive "religious educators," but rather is "a statement of the way mankind has found out everything which is known and has made whatever progress has been attained."[2] In other words, mankind has learned in and through experience. Elliott writes:

> All knowledge has grown out of man's experience with nature and with human beings. All the ideas of mankind are conclusions from and

---

1. Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 86.

2. ______, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 310.

> interpretations of experience. Science is not exception. . . . Religion is no exception to this dependence upon learning through experience. . . . An educational process seems fundamental in God's relation to human life. It may be said that God is an educator, for it is in and through educational process that religion has developed in the race. It is only through such a process that God becomes known or that an experience of God is achieved.[1]

It is in and through experience that the Christian life is developed. The way children and young people learn about God is similar to that through which the human race has come to its understanding of God through their experience with God's manifestation in human life. Therefore, any significant educational process must be related to the experience in and through which meaningful learning can take place. For the child, the most significant relationship which is analogous to the human experience of God is that of sharing with their parents and the feeling of "comradeship" in facing their crucial problems.[2] Doing things together with parents at home is good learning experience for children. This is related to the importance of the feeling of security in learning, which is the basis for moving forward in the adventure for new learning. This princi-

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, pp. 310-312.

2. Ibid., p. 278. Also see, Elliott, "How Is Growth Guided?" International Journal of Religious Education, Vol. IX (January, 1933), pp. 9. 24.

ple is also relevant in the counseling situation.[1]

In human learning, Elliott emphasizes also the importance of participation on the part of the learner. Robert W. Lynn made a comment on Harrison Elliott in his inaugural address at Union Theological Seminary saying:

> From the outset his emphasis was upon participation. Thus he developed the educational corollary of the political theory of direct government; and in doing so, he created a different picture of what the classroom might be.[2]

His emphasis on democratic participation continued through his later years in 1950 when he wrote an article on religion and the democratic society.[3] The participation is personal involvement in the process. This is also true in counseling. "Just as in education the student has to do his own learning, so in personal counseling the individual in the long run has to answer his own questions."[4] This is because both responsibility and authority are internal, subjective, and personal from Elliott's point of view.

---

[1] Elliott, Solving Personal Problems, p. 256.

[2] Robert W. Lynn, "The Religious Educators: Their Vision of Polity and Education," Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. XXI (January, 1966), p. 150.

[3] Elliott, "Religion and the Democratic Society of the Future," Religious Education, Vol. XLV (1950), p. 284. Also see, Elliott's "A Memorandum in Preparation for the New Lincoln School," Appendix, Harper's dissertation.

[4] ______, Solving Personal Problems, p. 227.

With regard to Elliott's view of human learning, it needs to be pointed out that the human personality is of social origin, and it is developed in the learning which takes place in informal and formal experience. Man is differentiated from animals by his learning. Man is born with the basis of "temperament," "original equipment," which is unique in each individual, and which limits each one's possibilities of learning and range of learning. The child begins to learn from the time of his birth and the process of his learning is gradual. "Through activity little by little more precise coordinations and differentiations are made" and "maturation is a factor in this learning."[1] Even though maturation extends the possibility of learning, it does not specify the kind of learning which is going to take place.

Man has the capacity to choose. This capacity can be found in man's original equipment and the ability to choose is cultivated in and through experience. One's "original equipment" is a condition which partly determines the things he loves and desires. Further, within the process of learning in and through experience "is included mental as well as physical activity as the individual reflects upon and interprets his experience."[2]

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, pp. 191-196.

2. Ibid., p. 312.

In concluding the description of Elliott's philosophy of Christian education, the following quotations may well give us a summary view of his thought:

> Religious education therefore is not an education with a fixed and predetermined content. . . . Rather, religious education is an enterprise in which historical experiences and conceptions are utilized in a process by which individuals and groups come to experiences and convictions which are meaningful for them today.[1]
>
> The function of religious education is to help children, young people, and adults to consider the problems involved in the situations they are facing with a view to discovering what is the Christian course of action or the Christian solution of the problem, and to make plans for carrying out these decisions in individual and group life. In turn, it has the function of examining and evaluating current action from the viewpoint of the Christian religion.[2]

It seems to Ernest J. Chave that the key sentence is: "Religious education is a process through which growth in Christian life and experience takes place, and in which Christian goals and beliefs are discovered."[3]

It may be well to mention some comments on Elliott's thought made by several dissertation writers. Major J. Jones describes Elliott as "a staunch defender of the experience-centered, life-situation, and social type of

---

1. Elliott, Can Religious Education Be Christian?, p. 310.

2. Ibid., p. 314.

3. Ernest J. Chave, "Thought Contributions of Harrison Elliott," Religious Education, Vol. XLVI (1951), p. 262.

education."[1] David Kyle Almon regards Elliott as being an endorsor of the basic philosophy which has been linked with Pestalozzi, Froebel, Dewey, Hall, Thorndike, James, Kilpatrick, Harthorne, May, the Gestalt psychologists, and above all, George A. Coe.[2] On the other hand, F. Nile Harper commented that Elliott "tended to emphasize the psychological order of current human experience and to neglect the logically ordered heritage," and that "he defined the educational approach in such a way as to over-emphasize group learning and under-emphasize individual study."[3]

Briefly, Elliott emphasizes the life-situation-centered group thinking process in education because man learns in and through experience, and because principles grow out of experience and have meaning only in relation to experience.

---

1. Major J. Jones, "The Place of God in the. . .," p. 260.

2. David Kyle Almon, "Personalism in Religious Education," pp. 112-113.

3. F. Nile Harper, "The Thought and Work of Harrison S. Elliott," pp. 76-78.

# CHAPTER V

# SHERRILL'S VIEW OF MAN

In studying Sherrill's view of man, one should note the depth of his understanding of man both from theological and from psychological points of view. His analysis of the human self is thorough and unique. His approach to human nature is wholistic. He sees man as a whole. He approaches man as a united entity in contrast to the Greek Platonic dichotomy which divides man into body and soul.[1] He sees also that this wholistic view of man is supported by modern "psychosomatic medicine."[2] He says that "the human creature is a whole; and that what happens, say, in his emotions may affect his physical health and be reflected in the functioning of any of the organs of his body."[3]

## 1. Man in God's Creation

From Sherrill's point of view, the doctrine that

---

1. Lewis J. Sherrill, Guilt and Redemption, (Richmond, Va.: Knox Press, 1945), p. 201. Also see, Sherrill, The Struggle of the Soul, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1951), p. 7. and Sherrill, The Gift of Power, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1955), p. 146.

2. Sherrill, The Struggle of the Soul, p. 7.

3. ________, Guilt and Redemption, p. 146.

man is created in the image of God is a significant symbolic representation from which he derives two important concepts about man. Firstly, the fact that man is created signifies his common share in the "creatureliness" with the rest of God's creation. Being a creature, man is "subject to all vicissitudes of nature" and is separate from the Creator. "His selfhood is disengaged from that of his Maker; his selfhood is not swallowed up and obliterated in God, but he stands as it were facing God his Creator."[1] He is not a small god, nor an emanation from God just as the rest of His creation. "As a created being, he is under the lordship of God."[2] This shows man's lot with and the nature of his relationship with the natural world.

Secondly, the fact that man is created in the image of God signifies man's unique relationship with God. He is more than a creature. This shows that man is given the ability to respond to God from within himself as a "self-determining creature."[3] This shows that man is given the freedom to make decisions and that human selfhood is a counterpart of the Divine Selfhood. This freedom

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, pp. 23-24.

2. Ibid., p. 113.

3. Ibid., p. 24.

is a "high water mark of his humanity."[1] Man can turn all his potentialities away from God and develop his relation only with man and nature. At the same time, man can turn all his potentialities toward God. In responding to God with his deepest "Yes" he builds a relationship and finds himself and truly knows himself.[2] Man is "a creature of God" and at the same time he is "a unique kind of creature."

There is another aspect in Sherrill's view of man which is implied in his concept of vocation and his concept of judgment. It is man's social nature. God's call is "to all men to devote all of life to the sovereignty of God" and this calling of God indicates:

> Vocation is social because it is a call into the religious society, universal. . . .Man as a social creature must live a social existence and can not live in isolation from his fellows.[3]

From Sherrill's point of view, judgment is both individual and social as "vocation" is.[4] This comes from man's unique relationship with God, i.e., the covenant relationship. Therefore, it seems that Sherrill's view of man as a social creature derives from this "symbolic representation," and that his emphasis on man's social nature is always in the context of "religious community." He does stress man's social nature in general. His focus is always on the "koinonia" within the Christian community, which plays a great part in his philosophy of Christian education.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 113.

[2] Ibid., p. 24.

[3] Ibid., p. 113.

[4] Ibid., p. 114.

With regard to the uniqueness of man, Sherrill also points out that it is only man who can ask questions about the meaning of life. Man searches for meaning. He asks "Does personal life, does the history of mankind, does the universe itself have any meaning?". Sherrill emphatically says, "To fail to ask this question is to fail to be fully human."[1] The realization of humanity in its full sense is to discover the meaning of one's life, the meaning of human history, and the meaning of the universe. Man is "capable of discerning meaning in existence and longing to find meaning in it, and yet can discern no meaning in what is happening. . . ."[2] Surely, to ask questions about meaning in one's own existence and in what is happening in the world is to face bafflement.

### 2. Sin and Man's Original Nature

Now we come to the question of sin and man's original nature. Unfortunately, Sherrill does not give a systematic interpretation about the meaning of sin, nor a clear view about man's original nature. Yet he is very much aware of the human predicament. Instead of the traditional term, "sin" he finds the "demonic element" to be the most appropriate word to describe the sinful element which has its root deep in human nature.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 115.

[2] Ibid.

Because of his awareness of the "demonic element" in man, Sherrill is able to point to the weakness and the superficiality of the pragmatic approach to education, and stresses the importance of "deeper changes in the self."[1] His insight into the nature of man makes him warn those optimistic teachers who seek only "creative performance in a group of persons" and overlook the existence of the "demonic element" in men. Performances do not prove the deep change in the self, because the "demonic element" is not so easily dealt with. In spite of the fact that man is a social creature and can not live in isolation from his fellows, "there is an element in human society so hostile to human values and so destructive of human selfhood that we can only call it demonic."[2] Sherrill points out that human predicament is "the predicament of the demonic element in human society," toward which the Biblical theme is pointed.[3]

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, pp. 153-154.

[2] Ibid., p. 113.

[3] Ibid.

In The Struggle of the Soul, Sherrill points out two mutually contradictory tendencies in man, i.e., "growth" and "shrinking back." He seems to equate "shrinking back" with the psychological term, "death instinct." But on the other hand, he points out that the motive of "shrinking back" is "demonic," and is a kind of "rebellion against God" according to "some modern theologians," whom he does not specify.[1] Since "lordship" is one of the eight major themes in the Bible Sherrill proposes, it would not be a great mistake to imagine that he would identify himself with those theologians who interpret "sinfulness of man" in terms of man's "rebellion against the lordship of God."[2]

Although Sherrill tends to use the "demonic element" in expressing his concept of sin in his later years, he seems strongly convinced that "hostility is the seed-bed of sin," and that sin is whatever keeps man out of love with God and one's neighbor. In one of his earlier writings, Sherrill deals with the concept of sin in relation to child guidance. He writes:

> Whatever breaks the supreme law of love toward God or man, in the Christian view, is sin. . . whatever breaks down the love, trust, confidence, and good will between any two people.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Struggle of the Soul, p. 11.

[2] ________, The Gift of Power, p. 114.

> Whenever two hearts in a home are held apart from one another by distrust, suspicion, misunderstanding, jealousy, flare of temper, ugly look, biting retort, sense of unfairness, smoldering anger, hatred, or any such barrier, sin is between them. And so too with whatever does harm. . . .[1]

It was in his later years that Sherrill adopted the term, "demonic element" in describing man's sinful nature.

There is another important aspect in Sherrill's concept of sin. It is his conviction that to sin against man is to sin against God. It is impossible to separate the relationship between man and man from the relationship between God and man. "In hurting one whom we can see even if only in imagination, we have also hurt Another."[2] It is noteworthy that there is special connotation in his use of capital letter, "Another," which signifies the divine "Another." This reflects also the basic nature of divine-human relationships.

According to Sherrill, guilt arises out of malignant relationships.[3] Sin is to be understood from the point of view of relationship. It is not something abstract. It takes place within human relationships and the relationship between God and man. Sin is not something dirty which needs to be cleansed in a materialistic and static sense. It is something involved with personal relationship, which is dynamic by its nature.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Opening Doors of Childhood, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1939), p. 98.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Sherrill, Guilt and Redemption, (Richmond, Va.: Knox Press, 1945), p. 130.

Sin is personal. Man is responsible for his sin. Sin is a matter of deepest seriousness and man is "responsible for the plight into which his own sins have brought him."[1] From Sherrill's point of view, the Biblical concept that the wages of sin is death is very sound. Based on his understanding of the Biblical teaching, he emphasizes man's responsibility for the sins of the fathers.[2] There is God's judgment. "God's disclosure of himself in judgment is his rejection of whatever in man or in the works of man is contaminated by sin."[3] God's judgment is regarded by Sherrill to be the confrontation of God's holiness with man's sinfulness and the revelation of God's righteousness, glory and wrath. It is not only those being outside the covenant who are under the judgment of God. "Always those who are within the covenant and inside the religious society are under judgment."[4]

With regard to the doctrine of original sin, Sherrill is aware that for a long time the church has sought to explain the existence of the worse self in man by creating the doctrine of original sin and often it has caused violent protest because it is presented in such harsh forms. The church becomes more and more apologetic about "original sin." The doctrine of original sin is really a difficult one in view of the fact that in Christianity responsibility is held within man himself.[1] Sherrill finds that modern psychology teaches precisely what the doctrine of original sin is meant to communicate. The terminology is different, but it deals with the same human problems, except that the psychologist as such does not make moral judgments because psychology is an objective description of the results of its investigation. Sherrill sees that the doctrine of biological heredity is not wholly different from the doctrine of original sin in stressing our kinship with the animal in structure and in disposition.[2]

---

[1] Sherrill, Guilt and Redemption, p. 130.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 114.

[4] Ibid.

Because of his psychological insight, Sherrill is aware of the necessity of differentiating the sick personality and sin. He points out that in the past history of the church,

> there are also stories of men and women who have not sinned so greatly, but who have felt a deep disharmony between themselves and God. Some of these people have been

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 162. Also see, Sherrill, The Opening Doors of Childhood, p. 167.

[2] Ibid.

been more sick than sinful.[1]

It seems to him that the morbid sense of guilt comes from personality disorders rather than man's sinful original nature.

To the question of whether man is born with a sinful nature or not, Sherrill does not give a direct answer. Yet he is very conscious of the existence of the demonic element in man and in society. In pursuing the answer to man's basic problem, he searches into other disciplines, philosophy, psychology, and non-Christian religions. He finds that there is a basic conflict in man, a kind of inner cleavage which exists in man. Any child soon learns of this conflict. Sherrill finds that this basic conflict externalized in the ancient gods in Babylonian mythology, in Vedic religion and in "Ying" and "Yang" in Chinese thought and internalized in man in Buddhism, Janism, and in Plato's famous story depicting the human soul as a pair of winged horses and a charioteer. Psychologists seek to explain man's basic conflict in various ways; depth psychologists lay emphasis on unconscious conflict; Otto Rank points out the conflict between eros love and agape love; Freud suggests "life instinct" and "death instinct" as an interpretation of man's basic conflict in his earlier writings but later he finds it more feasible to explain it

---

1. Sherrill, The Opening Doors of Childhood, p. 103.

as a struggle or conflict among the "id," "ego" and the "superego"; Carl Jung sees the basic difference between individuals in terms of being extroverted or introverted.[1]

Sherrill does not trace man's sinful nature and collective responsibility to the story of Adam and Eve in Genesis. Rather he deals with the problem of man's original nature from an existential point of view. He uses the term, "self" in describing man's core of being. It has four marks; 1)vitality, 2) self-determination, 3) self-consciousness, and 4) self-transcendence.[2] The first mark means the life of a living man. The second mark signifies the "ontological will" in determining to continue in being, to live or not to live, and the "psychological will" to determine "its own responses to that which confronts it from without and to tensions that arise within the self."[3] The third mark of selfhood is the consciousness of being a self and stating himself from within as an "I," "knowing himself as a subject-within-himself."[4] The fourth mark of self shows the act of looking at oneself, thinking about oneself, feeling toward oneself etc. This means that the human creature is both subject and object within himself. The human creature who is in nature is

---

1. Sherrill, Guilt and Redemption, pp. 13-38.

2. ________, The Gift of Power, pp. 2-14.

3. Ibid., p. 5. 4. Ibid., pp. 7-9.

able to transcend nature. Here is the spiritual quality of man.

Sherrill believes that there is the capacity for moral discrimination in normal individuals. "But how it sorts, will vary from one culture to another."[1] What he means is the capacity for moral discrimination which does not necessarily imply the capacity for moral action. According to Sherrill the basic problem of man is the same regardless of the limitations of time and space. The vocabulary may change in part as we go from the past to the present, from Nineveh and Athens to New York or Berlin, and from psychology to theology, but "the human creature with his hostility, anxiety, and guilt remains."[2] What man has lost is himself. He is indeed his own lost continent. It is hardly possible in Sherrill's writings to find an optimistic view of man, which emphasizes human goodness and his unlimited potentialities.

Briefly, Sherrill understands sin and man's original nature from the point of view of relationships--man's relationship with God, others, and oneself. Sin is the breakdown of personal relationships of love and trust between God and man, and between man and man. He realizes the existence of the "demonic element" in man and in hu-

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 68.

2. Ibid., p. 160.

man society. Sherrill also sees the necessity of differentiating between sin and the sick personality.

### 3. Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth

Sherrill approaches the problem of man's basic needs and human growth from both psychological and religious points of view, rather than from the physiological point of view.

One must be clear about man's basic needs in order to understand the process of human growth. What is the understanding of Sherrill concerning man's basic needs? It seems to him that man's basic needs are to be thought of in terms of personality needs, which are "just as real, just as important as his needs for food and shelter, be cause these needs, if wisely met, help a child to be 'at home in his universe'."[1]

In his mature years, as he crystallizes his thinking he summarizes man's basic needs into two which are to be met in order to achieve healthy personality development. "One is the need to identify himself with something greater and stronger than himself, as a means of protecting the self in its littleness against annihilation."[2] When this need is met, one has a sense of oneness with the object.

---

1. Sherrill, The Opening Doors of Childhood, p. vii.
2. ________, Guilt and Redemption, p. 96.

of his identification. There will be a feeling of unity, warmth, tenderness and the wonderful sense of well-being. This can be regarded as the need to love (agape). The second basic need is:

> to become an individual, a person, one who is not submerged, one who can respect himself in his own right, who can choose his own ends for striving, and can pursue those ends without external domination.[1]

When this second basic need is met, one has a sense of dignity as a person, and a sense of autonomy and individuality. This need, in contrast to the first one, is the need to be loved, the need for self-centered love (eros). One may identify too easily the need for identification with "growth," and the need for individuality with "shrinking back" in The Struggle of the Soul.[2] The need for identification can be regarded as "growth," but the need for individuality must not be identified too readily with "shrinking back." According to Sherrill, to become an individual is an important task in childhood in one's growing process.

In his description of the self, Sherrill points out that the human self is both a being and a becoming. In striving to become a self, man requires both togetherness and separateness. The concrete example for separateness is one's own birth, a breaking of togetherness with the mother in order to gain a separate physical entity. But apparently, one can not maintain a separate life for long because he has to have togetherness with those who care for him. This striving for togetherness can be regarded as the striving to meet the need for identification, and the striving for separateness the striving to meet the need for individuality. Human nature being what it is, both needs must be met and kept in some kind of balance if one is going to thrive. It is essential to maintain a kind of equilibrium in one's own life if he is going to live effectively and comfortably. Sherrill describes the necessity to maintain such equilibrium in the following words:

---

[1] Sherrill, Guilt and Redemption, p. 96.

[2] ________, The Struggle of the Soul, pp. 8-11.

> From birth onward a large part of his striving goes into the effort to have both the togetherness and separateness, and to hold them in such delicate balance that he will know the security of togetherness without forfeiting the security of separateness and vice versa. If either togetherness or separateness is attained at the expense of the other, deep anxiety is aroused, for the development of selfhood is then threatened. . . the self strives to keep the ways of meeting these two needs in balance, and to find ways to protect himself against the threat either of too great a togetherness or too great a separateness.[1]

The human struggle is no other than the struggle to maintain this equilibrium which results in one's inner peace

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, pp. 17-18.

of mind and well-being and harmony. This sheds light on our understanding of human growth and the struggle at every stage of life.

With regard to human growth, Sherrill divides man's life span into five stages; childhood, adolescence, young adulthood, middle-age adulthood, and old-age adulthood. In each stage of life, one has to solve its central problem if he is to grow into the next stage and move toward maturity. This idea corresponds with the concept of the developmental tasks of Havighurst.

During childhood, one has to go through three sub-stages; infancy, early childhood, middle and late childhood. The central problem in childhood is individuation which means to become an individual person, both from the child's and parent's points of view. The presentation and solution of the problem is not sudden and all at once, rather it is a slow and gradual process, and the kind of achievement in the next stage. Furthermore, "the kind of individuation which the child can achieve is governed to a large degree by what may be called parental adequacy."[1] What does Sherrill mean by parental adequacy? He means the emotional maturity of the parents, and this parental adequacy depends on the solution of the problem of growth which the parents have achieved. At his birth, the infant emerges into two classes of being, persons and things, and he must establish some kind of relation with each of these. He begins to learn how to relate to persons by means of his relation with the persons closest to him on whom he is most dependent for affection, food, comfort, and security. This person ordinarily is his mother. On the other hand, he is confronted with another order, i.e., things. Sherrill points out that if his first character need is that of learning to relate to persons, his second character need is that of learning to relate to things. Furthermore, how one begins to meet his second character need will be deeply influenced by the way in which his primary character need begins to be met. How one's primary character need is met is profoundly influenced and perhaps determined by parental adequacy. In the case of parents who can show acceptance and assume responsibilities of parenthood and also give a genuine and outgoing uninterrupted love to each other and to the child, the child is better enabled to pass without serious hampering into the next stage of growth. On the contrary, if the parents are not emotionally mature enough for parenthood and cannot give genuine love, they may seek substitutes for love and resort to things or avoid the normal responsibilities for parenthood. The consequence is that the infant is not able to relate deeply to the parents and later on to persons in general and makes things his master, instead of making things his servants, because his primary security is not in personal relations, but in things. There is another case of the person who, from the beginning, is not able to relate either with persons or things. The only world left for him is himself.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Struggle of the Soul, p. 25.

In his early childhood, a child is confronted not only by the world of persons in general, but by the world of males and females in particular. He must learn to relate to the parent of the opposite sex, as male or female according to the situation. The solution which is achieved will affect further three elements of character; first, the nature of the roles which the mother and the father will have in the later life of the child; second, the kind of conscience the child will have; third, the role which the child himself will take in life, as predominantly masculine or predominantly feminine.

In his middle and later childhood, his character need is to learn to relate to persons outside the family, persons of his own age, especially to those of the same sex, persons who have, or assume authority over him.

The central problem during the adolescent period is to become psychologically weaned from the parents.

The two great confrontations during adolescence are both essentially in the world of persons. The first one is the confrontation with "the world of persons of the opposite sex. The second is the world of history in the broadest sense, the present in its relation to the past and to the future."[1] One's capacity to release himself psychologically from the parents and to relate to persons of the opposite sex can not be known until the later adolescent period or even later. Sherrill finds four types of youth in terms of their hetero-sexual relationships; first, the youth who is able to relate easily to many persons of the opposite sex; second, the youth who is affect-hungry; third, the youth who continues to keep his friendship largely or wholly within the limits of his own sex; fourth, the youth who has few, if any, friends either among his own sex or the opposite sex. In regard to the second great confrontation in this period, Sherrill points out two forms; the first one is one's family tradition which tends to carry one from one generation to the next and the second one is the broader world of history, the pressure of secular values, the pressure of secularism in education, the pressure of secular authority, and the like.

With regard to young adulthood, Sherrill uses a significant title, "He Was Tempted," to describe the characteristics and problembs in this stage of life. One is tempted to avoid the manifold responsibilities of the adult world, shrinking back from meeting and carrying responsibilities at the adult level and lingering on in some kind of dependency, or shifting responsibilities to other shoulders. During young adulthood, the central problem is that of making the basic identifications around which a mature adulthood can be developed. In order to maintain the individuality and the freedom that have been achieved, one is tempted to cut as many ties as possible and become totally isolated from others, thus leaving some aspect of chracter frozen at the level of childhood or youth. One's achievement in making his basic identifications is shaped to a large degree by the nature and extent of the weaning he has achieved during the adolescent period. If one has been able to wean himself from his parents, his relationship with his parents can be at a mature level. Consequently, he is able to relate to others in the adult world and make his basic identifications; the ability to enter and to sustain marriage, the ability to encounter his economic responsibility, social responsibility, intellectual responsibility, and religious responsibility.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Struggle of the Soul, p. 49.

In middle life, the central problem of character development is to achieve a mature view of life and the universe. Sherrill makes a distinction between one's spontaneous philosophy of life and one's acquired philosophy of life. The former springs out of one's own life experience because it is one's own formula for coping with life. On the contrary, the latter is something one has been taught, because it springs out of the formulation and formulas of other people. It may or may not correspond with his own spontaneous philosophy of life. During the period of some two decades of middle life, one is confronted by the problem of solving the discrepancy between one's spontanous philosophy of life and his acquired philosophy of life, in order to achieve a mature view of life and the universe.

Sherrill points out three things which characterize a mature philosophy of life and the universe, namely, the depth from which the basic formula springs, the integrity between one's spontaneous philosophy and his acquired philosophy, and the capacity for dealing with unanticipated reality. It is common that in middle life one attempts to work out one's own statement of his philsophy of life and get rid of the discrepancy between one's character and one's philosophy, and thus reaches integrity. This is a sign of inward striving to achieve wholeness and unity within the self. But it should be noted that the quest for integrity between one's spontaneous philosophy of life and his acquired philosophy may take him in the direction of a less profound and less mature view of life. It can also become a degenerative type of experience.

In old age adulthood, the central problem of character development is that of simplification, "in its physical, material and spiritual aspects, so that the soul may with less and less impediment progress toward its chosen destiny."[1]

By the term "simplification of life," Sherrill means the process of

> distinguishing the more important from the less important, getting rid of the less important or relegating it to the margin; and elevating the more important to the focus of feeling, thought and action.[2]

For example, if one's view of life consists essentially of a materialism, then in his old age it can be expected that he will elevate things into "a sort of final sacramental act at the close of his life."[3] The character is tested during the later decades of life in which one has to go through the process of simplification. In old age adulthood, one changes his status in the complex web of family relationships. One remains the same as a father or mother or in some other capacities in the family but the meaning of his or her role is different. There are changes in economic status and changes in one's social

---

1. Sherrill, The Struggle of the Soul, p. 130.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

prestige also. Sherrill writes:

> In any event if one's essential status in personal relationships has been sound, then as age advances he can slough off the temporary aspects of the role he has been obliged to play without disturbing too greatly the core of his selfhood.[1]

The character is also tested by the dwindling of physical capacity and each diminution of capacity is a threat to the self. Although sex is of time, love abides forever. It should be noted also that the basic formula by which one has met life in his earlier years often tends in his old age adulthood to stand out with still greater clarity and simplicity. It is also possible that even in old age the spiritual outlook will not only grow simpler and clearer, but also grow more profound.[2]

Briefly, Sherrill sees that man's basic needs are to identify with something stronger and greater than oneself and to become an individual person. In the process of human growth, one has to solve the respective central problem in each stage of life; individuation in childhood, psychological weaning from the parents in adolescence, basic identifications in young adulthood, achieving a mature view of life and the universe in middle life, and simplification in old age.

---

1. Sherrill, The Struggle of the Soul, p. 134.

2. Ibid., p. 145.

## 4. Human Knowledge

Being a Christian educator, Sherrill does not reject human knowledge as a rival to his Christian faith, rather he accepts it as a partner which shares the same goal with religion. Both psychology and Christianity are concerned about the deeper changes which take place in man. Sherrill writes:

> Strikingly, the goal suggested by religion and that suggested by psychology and sociology are essentially the same in respect of marriage and family life. . . .Both religion and these sciences have in view the stabilization and enrichment of personality in marriage partners and in children. . .it is folly for those working in the name of religion to neglect the knowledge and insights to be gained from these sciences. . . .Religion and sciences need each other for the benefit of humanity.[1]

Sherrill regards modern psychology to be the science which yields insights to the understanding of human nature. He points out that two streams of modern psychology, namely, depth psychology and Gestalt psychology, have thrown light upon the nature of deeper changes in man. It is through these two disciplines that "the generalization that the human self is formed in relationship and if it is reformed, it is reformed in relationships" has been discovered.[2] Depth psychology, as Sherrill

---

1. Sherrill, Family and Church, p. 22.

2. ________, The Gift of Power, p. 156.

points out, discloses the important fact in man that emotion is always "ambivalent," and that "unconscious conflict" is the common lot of man.[1]

Because of the insights gained from the research in psychology and psychoanalysis which shed fresh light on human problems, Sherrill suggests that ministers should prepare themselves in psychology and other related fields and make use of the knowledge from these disciplines in dealing with family problems and other pastoral work. The minister should seek co-operation with lawyers, social workers and other specialists. He points out that we have much to learn from the secular fields.[2]

In his Sprunt Lecture at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, Sherrill says that because of such convictions, he has sought in those lectures to draw not only upon the Bible and theology, but also upon psychology and psychoanalysis in dealing with the problem of guilt and redemption. Even though we have much to learn from the secular fields, and modern science and technology are so advanced, Sherrill does not build his philosophy of Christian education purely on the basis of human learning. He sees that science can not be a substitute for religion, though he acknowledges the contributions of scientists. He denies

---

1. Sherrill, Guilt and Redemption, p. 49.

2. ________, The Gift of Power, p. ix.

dogmatic scientism as well as religious absolutism. In his writings, Sherrill shows his superb scholarship and abundance of knowledge in theological fields as well as in philosophy, literature, history, and science. Today, one tends to exalt experimental psychology but Sherrill is aware of the limitations of the quantitative psychology because its precise language becomes less and less capable of expressing what is happening. "One is obliged to turn instead to the symbolic language of poetry, music, art, and religion for terms with which he can communicate the subtleties of the new meaning."[1]

In addition to Sherrill's attitude toward human knowledge, we must inquire into his view of moral knowledge and the knowledge of God. With regard to one's moral knowledge, he emphasizes that in childhood one's sense of right and wrong are built up wholly out of parental moral judgments, and then these ideas begin to be directly or indirectly challenged by the judgment of his closest friends, associates, the groups of which he is a part, and public opinion in later years.[2]

Concerning the knowledge of God, he points out that between the age of six and twelve, a child is growing particularly in his ability to conceive the character of

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 154.

2. ________, The Opening Doors of Childhood, p. 91.

God. But for him, the qualities of God's character are still concrete. He does not think about abstract ideas nor understand the abstract qualities of God's character. The abstract concepts such as God's mercy, grace, revelation, redemption, justice, etc. are beyond his ability to comprehend.[1] But at somewhere near the age of twelve, he begins to show an ability to deal understandingly with abstract ideas in a way he is unable to do earlier. No doubt, there are exceptions. Individual children with unusual intelligence or exceptional ability may show it much earlier than others. But it is not possible to expect that all children understand abstract ideas about God during their childhood.[2] Children's ideas of God are very anthropomorphic. They think of God in physical terms and in concrete forms and details. They ascribe to God characteristics, feelings, and bodily forms such as man has. This anthropomorphism is a natural stage in children's thought of God.

Sherrill also points out that the parents, by what they themselves are and do, provide much of the material out of which children make their ideas of God. God is our Heavenly Father. Through the daily experience and contact with the father children get the image of the

---

1. Sherrill, The Opening Doors of Childhood, p. 41.

2. Ibid., p. 82.

Father. If a child has no experience at his home with which he can associate the idea of the Heavenly Father, then those who seek to help will find difficulty in finding a place at which to start. It is not too much to say that the first great teaching which a child receives concerning God is given him by his father and mother through what they are.[1] Sherrill emphasizes that "when the infant encounters love he encounters God," because God is love.[2] Thus one's idea of God is conditioned by his life experiences, because he understands God's revelation from his particular perception, which is highly selective. The Bible contains the record of original revelation and the interpretation of those to whom God revealed Himself. "Both the original perception of revelation and the report of that perception are inevitably conditioned by human psychological process."[3] They are bound to be colored by the past experience of those who receive revelation and those who keep the record of their interpretation and also by the cultural history not only of Israel but of much of the ancient world.[4] But on the other hand, Sherrill emphasizes theo-centricity in his doctrine of "revelation as confrontation,"--"God as Self confronts man as a self and has disclosed himself to man."[1] He points out that "physical nature, human nature, events in history and above all, Jesus Christ the living 'Word of God'" are the chief media employed by God to disclose himself and "a great part of God's disclosure of himself is made through what is already known."[2] But it is God who disclose himself and it is God himself whom we perceive. "Confrontation" implies that "what is revealed in the encounter between man and God is not information _about_ God, but God _himself_ as Personal Being."[3] It also implies that

---

[1] Sherrill, The Opening Doors of Childhood, pp. 37-39.

[2] ________, The Struggle of the Soul, p. 41.

[3] ________, The Gift of Power, p. 100. [4] Ibid.

> man is not himself a god, but faces God; and if in facing God he is drawn toward God he is not absorbed into God. But on the other hand it does _not_ need to imply, as some would have it, that God as Personal Being is wholly outside man as a personal being; for the doctrine of the Spirit of God means that God as Personal Being is perceived as present within man as a personal being, present within man yet not identical with man.[4]

Briefly, one can summarizes Sherrill's view about human knowledge by saying that he is not antagonistic toward human knowledge, as was Paul. If he were asked to identify his position, he would choose the Johanine tradition in his emphasis on utilizing human knowledge in communicating the Christian faith. Although he does not point out distinctively that human knowledge comes out of human experience, his theory of human perception is based on human experience. But on the other hand, for Sherrill, the doctrine of revelation is "the determinative element" in the life of the Christian community and in the philosophy of Christian education[1] because, essentially, his epistemology is theo-anthropocentric.

---

[1] Sherrill, _The Gift of Power_, pp. 68-69.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 70. [3] _Ibid._, p. 69. [4] _Ibid._

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 68.

## CHAPTER VI

## SHERRILL'S PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Following the same procedure of Chapter IV, we now turn to the investigation of Sherrill's view of freedom and authority in Christian education, objectives and content of Christian education, teaching methods and learning theory.

### 1. Freedom and Authority

Sherrill has not made a historical survey centered on the issue of freedom and authority, but his thought on this issue is reflected in his historical interpretation in his book The Rise of Christian Education because it is inevitable that one's interpretation of historical events is conditioned by his subjective view point.

In his interpretation of Jewish education, Sherrill points out:

> Judaism's education has succeeded in keeping that same ancient liberty. . . that is, the right of the Jew to take voluntarily upon himself the yoke of the commandments to the end that God and God only shall be his King.[1]

But this concept of God's kingship was challenged, "as the New Testament opens." It was discovered by some Jews that the kingship of God did not bring true liberty but "the deepest servitude which the soul could know." The New Testament teaching brought a new concept of liberty, which "spoke first and foremost to the soul of man. . . . Slowly, most slowly, it set out to free the whole man."[1]

---

[1] Lewis J. Sherrill, The Rise of Christian Education, New York: Macmillan Co. (1944), p. 72.

For Sherrill, the kingdom of God is not to be identified with any social reform program or a social ideal of one's own. In each generation, there is freedom to "discover the detailed forms through which the Christian's inner liberty can best be expressed by means of social and political channels. . . ."[2] If the kingdom of God is identified with any blueprint of social reform, there emerges a "subtle new slavery of spirit." Based on his understanding of the New Testament conception, Sherrill points out that "the true citizens of the kingdom of God are the only genuinely free men on earth."[3] Jesus invites each generation of men to re-evaluate themselves and their names. From the educational point of view, Sherrill points out:

> When persons in any age not merely receive the objective facts of his life, teaching, death, and resurrection, but whenever they also commence to "work over" the meaning, pondering it, absorbing it into the deepest

---

[1] Sherrill, The Rise of Christian Education, p. 12.

[2] Ibid., pp. 93-94.

[3] Ibid., p. 94.

> recesses of thinking, new life begins to break forth because new meaning has begun to break in.[1]

The dynamic of life comes out of personal labor over the meaning of His life, teaching, death and resurrection in one's innermost being. The objective facts about Jesus are not the direct source of new life. It is "the relation of child to Sovereign Father" that which "is capable to release the spirit even while one is in the grip of such dreaded tyrannies as poverty, mourning, hunger and persecution."[2] Freedom comes primarily from man's relation to God. Therefore, the source of new life and freedom is internal and not external. Sherrill's view of Jesus' ethic is also in the same line; "the ethic of Jesus is rather unimposing factor in society. . . ."[3] It does not depend on an external authority. "It flows out of and is constantly replenished by the Gospel of the Kingdom of God the Father. This ethic. . . must be rooted in Christian communities. . . ."[4] The sense of value of the individual is an important factor in the advancement of ethics, because it prevents cynicism.

In summarizing his Chapter on "Education in Primitive Christianity," Sherrill points out:

---

[1] Sherrill, The Rise of Christian Education, p. 98.

[2] Ibid., p. 110.

[3] Ibid., p. 118.

[4] Ibid.

> The tradition itself was the guarantee of liberty, and to surrender the tradition meant surrendering freedom. Consequently there was the strongest insistence that the tradition be kept alive in thought. . . . And yet there was the widest liberty of conscience and action. . . and not one whit of it was to be surrendered, whether the demand were from religion itself or from any other quarter. . . .Thus there was opportunity to experiment with liberty in an actual society, free from external domination yet receiving the impulse from beyond oneself to express a seeking love. There was a fixed point of reference, yet there was full scope for individual contributions to the social whole, without permitting one person to dominate the community through his subjectivism in declaring the will of God.[1]

Here we see that the issue of freedom is a key one from Sherrill's point of view in his interpretation of the educational history of the church. It is through the establishment of Christianity in the fourth century when Theodosius I made the decree that "nationalism began to triumph over catholicism of spirit" and that there was "the quick emergence of political pressure on the private domain of man's thinking." Conformity to a state approved interpretation of the tradition was demanded. "When a man heard any Christian teaching it was more natural to ask whether it conformed, than to ask whether it was true."[2]

Sherrill also points out that the perennial problem in the history of the Christian people was the tensin

---

1. Sherrill, The Rise of Christian Education, p. 167-168.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 174.

between two needs of the spirit; "one need arose because in so troubled an existence, mind steadily demanded the security which roots in faith." The other need arose because the yearning to carry out the meaning of that faith was kindled steadily by the Christian teaching with regard to the autonomy of the individual. It is "the tension between the demand for fixity in the tradition, and the demand for unfettered liberty of spirit."[1]

In search for an objective basis of authority, the church eventually determined the irreducible minimum of the Christian faith, i.e., the core of Christian teaching. Sherrill's description of the development of church authority is very similar to that of Elliott's quotation from MacGiffert, "the four-fold system of authority." In due course of time, "a constitutional ministry, as against a charismatic ministry, won the authority of the Christian community." But it is note-worthy that Sherrill writes:

> And yet the striking fact is that autonomy in the Christian teaching was genuine enough and gripping enough to impel men to break out of order and safety, and to do it within the confines of the very system which threatened to smother the spirit.[2]

The tension between an effort to preserve individuality in spiritual experience as against the solidarity of the church, between finality and openess, and between fixity and growth, runs through the history of the church. The solution of this tension determines the type of education the church has at the time. Experimentalism in Sherrill's interpretation of history is quite evident in his concluding chapter entitled "The Results." He writes:

---

[1] Sherrill, The Rise of Christian Education, p. 176.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 181.

> Our principal concern for the time being is education given by the church, and we are seeking to know the effects upon persons. The results can best be expressed in terms of a varying process of interaction between the individual and the Christian society, a variable Christian social experiment if one chooses to stress that aspect, a continuing experiment with varying results in persons.[1]

Therefore, it seems proper to conclude from Sherrill's interpretation of the rise of Christian education in the past that one of his basic concerns is the issue of freedom in each generation and that he has high regard for freedom in education. His view is essentially that of a dynamic nature in contrast to that which supports static conformity in teaching. Sherrill points out how the church was aware of the danger of subjective claims of God's revelation to the individual by the Spirit. This indicates that he does not advocate dogmatic subjectivism, nor absolutize individual freedom and liberty of spirit, although he emphasizes individual autonomy in education. He does

---

1. Sherrill, The Rise of Christian Education, p. 293.

not advocate extreme freedom.

In his critical evaluation of the revelancy of "the conditioned response" theory to Christian education, Sherrill reveals his basic position in supporting human autonomy.[1] In other words, he regards authority to be internal. It is one's inner self-determination that leads to the change in depth in man. Conditioning leads to manipulation and imposition by the teacher. This violates the "selfhood of the human creature" and makes human personality merely "the sum of our habits."[2] Based on the same reason, he holds that learning by insight is of great relevance and value in Christian education. Sherrill's emphasis on the internal nature of authority can also be seen from his discussion of the question; whether the seat of responsibility resides internally or externally. His answer is that from the Christian point of view the seat of responsibility is within each one of us.

Further questions with regard to the issue of freedom and authority are: What is the ultimate source of authority? What is the fundamental determinative factor in the educational process? Is the ultimate authority seen to be existing internally within man or externally? In theory, Sherrill sees the core of Christian education

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, pp. 147-148.

2. Ibid., p. 148.

to be the revelation of God.[1] The ultimate basis for Christian education is God's Self-disclosure.

He makes it very explicit at the outset of his endeavor to contribute a new philosophy of Christian education that it should come from within the Jewish-Christian tradition and not from outside; "it must draw its inspiration from the peculiar genius of the Christian community and of Christian faith rather than from any form of secular society or secular education."[2] For Sherrill, revelation is not some new information about God to be digested, or "a list of new rules to be observed or old old ones to be furbished up again." It is man's encounter with God and God's confrontation with man. It is not propositional but relational. It is through a "Person who offers himself to us in love and in judgment, and calls upon us to give ourselves as a living sacrifice in response. It is a matter of personal communion."[3]

Therefore, it is evident that the Bible is not the ultimate source of authority. It is merely a record of God's revelation and a source of knowledge about God's revelation and man's response to it. The Bible is a source for Christian education. The subject matter is not the determinative factor in Christian education.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, pp. 83-84.

[2] Ibid., p. ix.

[3] Ibid., pp. 83-84.

The Christian community is not the source of authority as it is pointed out by Sherrill in his comparison of the secular and the religious conceptions of education. He writes:

> In the case of a secular community the educating society is the state, or some segment of it. The state is in some sense sovereign. . . . And the state imposes its will upon the secular community by determining that there shall be a system of education, determining by authority what that system of education shall be, . . . In the case of the Christian community the educating society is the Christian community itself. It acknowledges a sovereignty which is above that of state. Since it faces the fact of revelation, it operates under conditions which not only permit but call for a constant corrective of itself from beyond itself.[1]

What is this sovereignty which is above that of the state? It must be the sovereignty of God. But who is God? The answer is determined by God's Self-disclosure and man's response to it. Therefore, the authority actually resides in the process of God's confrontation with man and man's encounter with God. The authority is found in man's relation to God. With regard to the distinctive character of Christian education, Sherrill points out that its distinctiveness rests on its bearing witness to revelation, on the nature of the society in which it is carried on, and in the center of its concern. What is the center of its concern?

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 80.

Sherrill expresses his view in the following words:

> It is concerned with the encounter between the Self-disclosing God and the responding human self. It is not concerned with God and his nature considered in abstraction from man and man's condition. It is not concerned with man and his needs considered apart from God. It is concerned with man in his need encountering God who confronts him in Self-giving. Strictly speaking, then, this education is not God-centered, nor it is man-centered. It is bi-polar; that is, it is concerned with the *meeting* between God and the human creature, and with the tension which rises within the encounter, calling for human response to God and for divine response to man.[1]

This divine-human encounter and confrontation becomes the source of authority in Christian education.[2] "Man's confrontation with divine revelation is for Dr. Sherrill the core of Christian education."[3]

Briefly, Sherrill has high regard for freedom, inner spiritual liberty, and human autonomy in education. He regards internal authority as the most legitimate form. The Bible is not the ultimate source of authority. The determinative factor in Christian education is in man's relation to God. Christian education is not God-centered, nor is it man-centered. It is bi-polar.

---

1. Sherrill, *The Gift of Power*, p. 90.
2. Sara Little, *The Role of the Bible in Contemporary Chtristian Education*, pp. 24, 80-81.
3. George M. Schreyer, *Christian Education in Theological Focus*, pp. 32-33. Also see, Roy W. Fairchild, "The Contribution of Lewis J. Sherrill to Christian Education," *Religious Education*, Vol. LII (1958), p. 405.

## 2. Objectives of Christian Education

What is Sherrill's view of the objectives of Christian education? What does he conceive to be the goal toward which one should plan the educational process in the Christian community? What should be the criteria for evaluating the achievements of the educational program of the church?

Although one can find only spotty answers from Sherrill's earlier writings which represent the formative stage of his philosophy of Christian education, his position is systematized in his The Gift of Power, which represents his mature thinking. During the latter half of the 1930s, Sherrill considered it to be the task of education "to guide the changes in skills so that they shall take place in the most economic manner. . . ."[1] He also pointed out that there are at least three great tasks of education: 1) to help persons learn to face conditions as they actually are, 2) to help people make discriminative judgments, and 3) to help persons work co-operatively, intelligently and in good will.[2] As he discusses adult education in the church, he points out that the church's education is distinctive in three respects: its distinctive purpose, its distinctive medium for the church's education and its distinctive activity within the church. How does he conceive this distinctive purpose? He conceives it to be that "man should enter into right relation with God."[1] In his later years, Sherrill expounded this by writing

---

[1] Lewis J. Sherrill and John Edwin Purcell, Adult Education in the Church, Richmond, Va. : Presbyterian Committee of Publication, (1936), pp. 52-53.

[2] Ibid., pp. 53-54.

> A statement of the ends sought in Christian education might contain such elements as these: that they might attain to increasing self-understanding and self-knowledge and an increasing realization of their own potentialities: that they might sustain the relationships and responsibilities of life as children of God.[2]

All these involve changes of the self. Sherrill is particularly concerned about changes in depth. From his point of view, "education in its broadest sense has to do with the changes which take place in persons" and "these changes are caused by the interaction between persons." The purpose of education is to "seek to guide it toward those ends which the society regards as most worthy."[3] It is to participate in striving to attain selfhood in the process of becoming a person. Sherrill is aware of the fact that there has been a certain degree of sympathy among both secular and Christian educators

---

1. Sherrill, Adult Education in the Church, p. 98.

2. _______, The Gift of Power, p. 83. 3. Ibid., p. 79.

with an open-ended view of education, a view that "there is no 'end' at all in education except such as exists within the process of interaction." But he also indicates that this type of view does not "take adequate account of the demonic element in human interaction, nor the demonic purposes to which intelligence in interaction can be turned."[1] For this reason, this type of view is rejcted by some educators in both the secular and religious fields. At least, they frankly assume the responsibility of defining the educational objectives to be sought in the midst of the twentieth century. What then are the educational objectives to be sought in the Christian community? Sherrill points out three objectives which are commonly stated in different ways; 1) the development of the self, 2) worthy citizenship in the kingdom of God, 3) worthy membership in society.[2]

Sherrill says in his comments on Paul H. Vieth's Objectives in Religious Education that his work was a "landmark in defining the ends sought in Christian education," and that it had deeply influenced the programs in denominations.[3] From his educational point of view, Sherrill does not regard it as desirable to make a statement of educational objectives in a highly specific way. The reason is stated as follows:

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 81.

[2] Ibid., pp. 81-82. [3] Ibid., p. 198.

> For the more specific the aims become, the more surely are we drawn into the business of trying to predetermine for others what their behavior and what their feelings should be; and then accordingly the more inevitably are we drawn into manipulating them to make this come true.[1]

In avoiding both perils, the peril of being over-specific in stating the educational objectives and the peril of no "end," Sherrill suggests that the presently existing self should be kept at the center of concern, and that the principal changes are the "changes in the depths of the self" and not the changes "at the periphery of the self." "Here the concept of revelation as confrontation takes on especial significance for Christian education."[2] Here we can see Sherrill's concept of authority and freedom in Christian education being essentially in harmony with his view of the educational objectives in the Christian community. Both are related to the concept of "relation," a framework for confrontation and encounter which is personal by its very nature. The purpose of the use of the Bible in Christian education is not far from his basic concept of relation. It is "to prepare the way for men to perceive God and respond to him in the present. We call this the purpose of the continuing encounter."[3]

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 83.

2. Ibid., 3. Ibid., p. 94.

Under this central purpose, there are contributing ones, such as, "to introduce the members of the Christian community in each generation to the revelatory events, the persons, the struggles, the defects and the achievements" which constitute the Judeo-Christian heritage, and "to think and communicate in terms of Biblical symbols."[1] It should be noted that Sherrill does not use the word, "transmit." He uses the word, "introduce" instead, because it has no mechanistic connotation as the word "transmit" has. Rather, it has personal meaning in it.

Sherrill points out clearly that the great differences between the objectives of secular education and those of Christian education lie not only in the statement of objectives, but basically in the different concepts about the nature of the human self, the obligations of being a member in human society, and "above all in regard to the concept of the sovereignty of God over men and nations."[2] He states the objectives of Christian education in the following words:

> Christian education is the attempt, ordinarily by members of the Christian community, to participate in and to guide the changes which take place in persons in their relationships with God, with the church, with other persons, with the physical world, and with oneself.[3]

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, pp. 95-96.

[2] Ibid., 82.

[3] Ibid.

### 3. Content of Christian Education

What does Sherrill consider to be indispensible elements in the educational process? What are the materials to be used for curriculum planning? What are the sources of these materials?

An examination of Sherrill's writings shows the intrinsic correlation between his view of the objectives to be sought in the educational process and his view of its content. He draws the educational materials from the Bible, the Christian community, life experiences, and the so-called secular fields in guiding the changes in persons "in their relationship with God, with the church, with other persons, with the physical world, and with oneself."

For the change in one's personal relationship with God to take place, the experience of divine-human encounter is indispensible. This experience of God confronting man and man's encountering God is in its strict sense God's revelation to man and man's response to God. Although the Bible is not the revelation itself, "it is the written record of the revelation to which the church as a living community continues to testify."[1] The Bible points to the revelation of God and is a witness to it.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 93.

Sherrill points out that chronologically the church existed before the Bible, and that for the purpose of giving instructions to the congregation and other purposes, canonical writings were selected from a mass of religious writings. Therefore, the church must interpret the Bible to the people. It is clear that "the modern church stands where the ancient church stood, in that the Bible is the principal source from which the church's teaching is drawn."[1]

Sherrill also cautions us regarding the undesirability of having any pre-determined absolute doctrine about the Bible as the only educational content. This would rob the people of their liberty to hear God's word from the Bible and the liberty which "permits the Bible to speak its message to the people." Any pre-determined doctrine will stand between the Bible and the people. "This is the profound embarrassment of Protestantism. It is the road by which we may easily slip into a Protestant authoritarianism."[2] This can easily become the substitute for the Roman authoritarianism which the Protestants seek to avoid. "We are not the light, neither is the Bible itself the light, but both we and it witness to the Person who is light."[3] Therefore, one of the major functions of the church is to

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, pp. 93-94.

2. Ibid., p. 94. 3. Ibid.

introduce the Bible to the people. Sherrill indicates that "Jesus himself was a teacher," and that "the content of his teaching is commonly regarded by Christians as being the norm for all Christian teaching. . . ."[1] He says, "If there is one theme that runs through the recorded teaching of Jesus, that theme is the kingdom of God."[2] Sherrill concludes that there are eight themes in the Bible and "each of them is in correspondance with some profound human predicament." These are: 1) creation, 2) lordship, 3) vocation, 4) judgment, 5) redemption, 6) re-creation, 7) providence, and 8) the life of faith.[3] He sees that they are inseparably interwined throughout the Bible, and that the culmination of these themes is the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Tensions exist among these themes because not all parts of a theme are saying the same thing. In one theme there is a great variety of meaning; the most notable tension is the one "between the theme as expressed in the Old Testament and the same theme as expressed in the New Testament."[4] These themes are related to the original

---

1. Sherrill, "A Historical Study of the Religious Education Movement," Orientation in Religious Education, ed. by Philip H. Lotz, p. 15.

2. _______, Guilt and Redemption, p. 171.

3. _______, The Gift of Power, pp. 112-116.

4. Ibid., p. 111.

revelation of God in history, yet they are "concerned with the situation that exists within man." The most significant portions of the Bible are those bearing directly upon the situation of the existing human-self. In the Bible, there are elements that "are concerned with the disaster and with the triumph in the inward man." The relevance of the Bible for today's existing self is intrinsic in the nature of the Bible, because it seems to Sherrill that "the Bible can awaken and foster man's continuing perception of this continuing divine confrontation, and can guide his continuing response to it."[1]

Even though Sherrill stresses the necessity of including the Bible in the curriculum, he does not mean that "the curriculum materials of Christian education should consist of nothing but the Bible."[2] The Bible is an important and necessary element in the content of Christian education but not the only element which constitutes the total curriculum. He also emphasizes the importance of the worshipping community as the context in which the Bible can come alive. The worshipping community provides a kind of "relational content" for Christian education. The "relational content" is essential from Sherrill's point of view because his interpretation of God's revelation is relational rather than propositional, and because his philosophy of Christian education is based on his interpretation of God's revelation as God confronting man and man's encounter with God. The worshipping community is important because it provides a context in which the continuing encounter between God and man takes place.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 94.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 99.

On the other hand, Sherrill stresses that the revelation has to be perceived by men; that God's Self-disclosure is to human selves; and that human perception, both the original and the report of that perception, are conditioned by human psychological processes. Therefore, the cultural history of Biblical times, textual criticism, archaeology, anthropology, and psychology are also sources for the content of Christian education. But at the same time, Sherrill warns against the authoritarian use of "the latest results of scientific study."[1] In stressing the utilization of the knowledge from scientific study of history, the Bible, and human nature, he does not idolize science. Science can not take the place of God's revelation. There is always a temptation for us to "overwhelm the revelation of God by a not very inspiring revelation of our selves, parading our 'knowledge'."[2] In order to perceive God's revelation rightly as it is recorded in the Bible, "details

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 100.

2. Ibid., p. 101.

concerning geography, politics, customs, modern explorations and excavations" are important elements in the educational process, but one must not lose his way in the "wood." God's revelation is the central element in the content of Christian education. Likewise, life situations are important in curriculum planning, but they should not preoccupy the total curriculum to the extent that the Biblical message is crowded out. Sherrill does not confine himself to the original revelation of God. "The original revelatory event can be reperceived with new and deeper meaning as time passes."[1] This principle gives God's revelatory history a primal place in the content of Christian education. God's revelation is not the historical events themselves, but the meanings communicated through the events. Even so, God's revelatory history is indispensible.

There are materials planned for and selected purposefully from the Bible, the results of scientific study of Biblical times, and texts for the curriculum. But we must not ignore the fact that there are also unplanned materials which life itself presents. These materials are "as it were thrown into an already dynamic situation, precipitating fresh interaction between the persons concerned. . . ."[2] For Sherrill, these unplanned materials which life itself presents are more effective than the planned ones because informal education is more powerful than formal education.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 73.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 176.

Briefly, Sherrill sees that the content of Christian education consists of Biblical materials, the results of scientific study of the Biblical times and of man, the Christian community, and life situations of the learners.

### 4. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory

It should be indicated at the outset of our discussion of Sherrill's view of teaching methods and learning theory that his major concern in his writings is not to prescribe certain teaching techniques; rather he is concerned about the basic principles which underlie the planning of the educational process. For him, Christian education is more than teaching technique. For this reason, "teaching method" should be understood in terms of "educational approaches" or "educational principles."

Sherrill emphasizes the importance of the learner's participation and involvement in the educational process. In answering the question--How does the church educate? he points out seven ways in which changes in persons take place. They are: 1) by social participation, 2) by experimenting, 3) by the idea one forms of himself, 4) by our crises, 5) by taking counsel together, 6) by contact with personalities, 7) by being told. The church educates its people in all these ways.[1] It can be easily noticed that almost all of these are related to the learner's participation and involvement, with the exception of the last one which implies the passivity of the learner. In studying Sherrill's earlier writings, one can frequently come across his emphasis not only on the involvement of the teacher but also the involvement of the learner. There should be opportunities for the children to participate in family worship just as naturally as they participate in other aspects of family life.[2] Unless there is genuine participation by the learner, "the young tend to become onlookers, rather than to feel they are true sharers." The result would be that they grow in the ability to discuss the meanings of religion without having spontaneous religious experience, and that "they easily become critics, but not creators."[3]

We can also find this emphasis on the learner's participation and involvement in his later writings. In his discussion about the use of the Bible, Sherrill stresses the type of teaching "characterized by becoming involved in the Bible, in contrast with being put under pressure from

---

1. Sherrill, Adult Education in the Church, pp. 87-96.
2. _______, The Opening Doors of Childhood, p. 125.
3. Ibid., p. 159.

the Bible."[1] He believes that such teaching will help the learner encounter the Bible itself and what it contains in a meaningful way, and stand within the Bible, participating in it.

In discussing education in small churches, Sherrill points out the importance of "drawing persons into places of responsibility."[2] He believes that growth does not take place if one remains in the state of idlenss. He suggests that we place appropriate responsibilities upon children and youth as soon as possible so that they can participate in the work of the church.

Sherrill concludes that creative teaching does not come out of the teacher's own planning for the learner without involving the latter's participation in thinking and in carrying out the plan. Creative teaching comes out of shared experiences in which the teacher and the learner kindle each other's thoughts and do things together in friendly companionship with the sense of security and freedom which are essential for personality development.[3]

In order to encourage the learner's participation and involvement in the educational process, the teacher often gives rewards to the learner as stimuli. Sherrill is very critical of such practice because it often results in a bitter feeling instead of love among the learners. The incentive to participate in the educational process should create the desire to become a certain kind of man according to one's ego-ideal.[1] Competition is a poor tactic to be used in creative teaching. Sherrill suggests Jesus' life as the highest ideal for the learner to have.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 98.

[2] ________, Religious Education in the Small Church, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1932), pp. 109-118.

[3] ________, The Opening Doors of Childhood. pp. 8-12, 156.

Even though Sherrill puts his emphasis on the learner's participation and involvement, he does not totally deny the validity of "telling" in Christian education. He acknowledges that there is a place for "telling" in Christian education because "something not of our own making confronts us from beyond ourselves as a given and it is our business to know this given. . . a gift to us, not a creation by us."[2] He sees not only the importance of the human search for truth in his emphasis on the learner's participation and involvement but he also sees the possibility of being confronted by the truth which is beyond the orbit of human creativity. Therefore, it seems to Sherrill that "telling" has its proper place in Christian education. He also points out how easy it is "to underestimate the readiness of the young for a certain amount of direct instruction in matters of religion."[1] But "telling" is not the only method. Besides "telling," he draws our attention to "group process" and "counseling"--"individualized help."[2] Here, we can see that Sherrill develops his teaching methods from his understanding of revelation in which "God takes the initiative in confronting man."[3] This is why Sherrill does not confine the use of the Bible to the "problem-centered" approach. For him, to do so "is to forget the nature of revelation and the nature of its record."[4] Two ways are possible in the use of the Bible; one can start either with the Bible and move toward human problems, or vice versa. The study of the Bible is as important as the study of current human problems.

---

[1] Lewis J. Sherrill, Understanding Children, (New York: Abingdon Press, 1939), pp. 103-104. Also see, Nyberg, "A Comparative Study of Key Concepts. . ." pp. 316-317.

[2] Sherrill, "Theological Foundation of Christian Education," Union Seminary Quarterly Review, (Jan., 1951), p. 8.

According to Sherrill, the underlying principle in the teaching-learning process is two-way communication, which reflects God's revelation and human response. From this

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 99.
2. ________, Family and Church, p. 174.
3. ________, The Struggle of the Soul, p. 19.
4. ________, The Gift of Power, p. 181.

perspective, one can understand his criticism of the man-centered approach in education. Sherrill sees that the experimentalism of John Dewey represents only man's search for truth and neglects the possibility of being confronted by the truth. He says, "Education can be based on a philosophy of encounter, and when this is done it will have to take account of confrontation in a way which pragmatism can not do."[1]

Either in the search for truth or being confronted by the truth, either in beginning with human problems or with God's revelation, there should be two-way communication. Sherrill writes:

> In this, communication flows in both directions, back and forth, between two or more persons. . . . It is communication by participation; for each takes part in the life of the other, especially in the interior life of the other. . . .[2]

But this two-way communication can degenerate into manipulation, "in which persons are treated as things." Impartation which is the giving forth of oneself in communication with another self can degenerate into transmitting inert materials from one person to another without meaningful interaction for both. Sherrill describes this two-way communication.

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 175.

2. Ibid., p. 121.

> In terms now made familiar by Martin Buber, true two-way communication takes place in an "I-Thou" relationship. In such communication separateness is overcome. Hearing becomes understanding. Seeing becomes perceiving. Compassion arises because if one suffers, the other suffers also.[1]

Sherrill always regards the "koinonia" in the Christian community as the best medium through which Christian education is carried. Persons change in depth not because of the propositional content without feeling and emotion. Changes in persons take place in "I-Thou" relationships. "The society, small or large, in which there is genuine fellowship in the spirit of Christ, is one in which education can have worth."[2] It is Sherrill's conviction that "the normal scene of revelation is the scene where fellowship exists,"[3] and that the fellowship of the Christian community is revelatory. Thus, he defines the "koinonia" in these terms:

> Koinonia is a kind of community which transcends ordinary human community in that God is present and participant in the community. For the connotation of koinonia is that the Spirit of God is forthgoing into, and present in, every relationship within the community. Thus it signifies that every relationship in the Christian community participates in God and God in it, whether it be the relationship of persons to persons, or of each to all, or all to each; while the whole community as a whole participates in God and God in it. Thus koinonia is by its nature a community intimately indwelt by the Spirit.[4]

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 121.

2. ________, Religious Education in the Small Church, p. 32.

3. The Gift of Power, p. 78. 4. Ibid., p. 50.

God uses the Christian fellowship as a means by which persons are changed. When there is a deep and genuine communication between two selves, persons who participate in it experience the love of God. "It is the profoundest kind of communication."[1] Therefore, one can conclude that for Sherrill, the basic questions to be asked in evaluating any teaching methods for Christian education are; 1) Does it facilitate two-way communication between human selves? and 2) What kind of interaction does it set up between selves? We should guard against the temptation of adopting any particular teaching method as the method for Christian education.[2] Any method can become spiritual if the teacher has spiritual motif and is able to grasp the meaning of interaction. Likewise, any method can become demonic if it allows persons to remain detached and in a position to manipulate others. Sherrill suggests several principles for the use of the Bible and each of them indicates some aspects of communication between human selves and the psychology of interaction. They are:

1) The principle of non-verbal communication. The earliest communication in one's life is non-verbal and "at all ages nonverbal communication is a channel for two-way communication of feeling and emotion."[3] Love which is the

---

1. Sara Little, The Role of the Bible in Contemporary Christian Education, p. 146.

2. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 185. 3. Ibid., p. 186.

essence of God's revelation "depends primarily upon nonverbal means for its communication and for its validation."

2) The principle of participation. The method should help people today "stand inside the Bible and participate with its people in their encounter with God."[1] It should help people participate with those who took part in the Biblical events and understand why they did hold their faith and participate with them in their feelings.

3) The principle of identification. Participation in the Bible means some degree of identification with its people, their mistakes and good character, so as to understand oneself. Sherrill points out that "the relation of the believer to Jesus Christ, in one of its aspects, is identification."[2] This is faith.

4) The principle of perception. "To a large extent the human response to revelation consists in the perception of meaning,. . . . Biblical material is a means for changing the perception of the meaning. . . ."[3] This change in perception takes place "in the total configuration of things which life presents," and incurs transformation of the meaning in life.

5) The principle of symbolic communication. Man com-

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 187.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 188. 3. *Ibid.*, p. 189.

municates mostly by means of symbols, and the symbols in the Bible are common means of communication in Christendom. The Bible is "the mother tongue" of the Christian community. We should seek those methods of teaching which create "the situation in which the leader can recognize and respond to symbolic expression of any member of his group" and the situation "in which the significance of symbolic communication regarding human predicament and regarding divine revelation can be explored with full candor and complete safety."[1]

6) The principle of ambivalence. Human feelings are ordinarily mixed; "affection is mingled with rejection, like with dislike, love with hatred."[2] Methods of teaching should allow a place for ambivalence in response to God's revelation. They should allow a place for the resulting dialogue between the "Yes" and the "No"; a possibility for deeper interaction.

7) The principle of ultimacy. Sherrill points out that "the communion to which true communication leads is an ultimate good."[3] It is the communion "in which persons can open themselves to one another in complete security" that the methods of teaching should facilitate. The "koinonia" in the Christian community is the ultimate.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 189.

[2] Ibid., p. 190.

[3] Ibid., p. 191.

Our second major concern in this section is about Sherrill's view of human learning. He seems to prefer the term "change" to the commonly used word "learning" because the former has wider implications than the latter. In his discussion about "changes in persons" he draws our attention first to the physiological changes in man. He is critical of the assumption that "physiological changes go on apart from emotional, mental, or spiritual control, . . ."[1]

Sherrill's basic position with regard to learning theory can be found in his critical evaluation of the relevancy of conditioned responses, learning by trial and error, learning by insight, and changes in the depth of the self in Christian education. He is critical of the type of learning known as "conditioned responses" to some degree because he sees that to follow this principle in Christian education without any discretion is to make human "personality but the sum of our habits," and learning becomes merely the conditioning of responses. He suggests that "the principle of conditioned response needs to be supplemented by other principles of learning."[2] Yet he is also aware of the value of conditioned responses which yields clues to the understanding of the process of human interaction through experiments with animals.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 146.

[2] Ibid., p. 148.

With regard to learning by trial and error, Sherrill acknowledges its contributions as well as its limitations to educational theory and practice. It has strong connotations about man's animal nature and the tendency "to approach the learner from the outside, as if he had no interior life over which he held command."[1] It tends to neglect the will of the learner. Sherrill regards Dewey's work based on trial and error to be of value for Christian education from two perspectives; firstly, its "importance attached to the individual's own experience in the learning process as compared with secondhand experience," and secondly, "the importance attached to the sharing of experience, so that learning becomes a social experience."[2] On the other hand, Sherrill points out the erroneous ancient belief of Dewey's philosophy that "the way to triumph over the irrational is to be more rational, " and the tendency to restrict "truth" to scientific truth only.

Concerning "another type of learning known as learning by insight" Sherrill points out that "the formulation of principles underlying this type of learning is based on Gestalt psychology," and that there are both agreements and disagreements between Gestalt psychologists and those who rely heavily on conditioned responses and learning by trial and error. Gestalt psychology elevates "the principle of response to a relationship and the principle of insight."[1] The sense of need is regarded as a motive for learning by Gestalt psychologists as well as other experimental learning theorists. So also is "the importance of the memories of feelings associated with a particular stimulus or situation" emphasized by them all. For Sherrill, Gestalt psychology supplements and corrects conditioned responses and learning by trial and error. It is more relevant to Christian education than the other two. He sees that "the principle of insight is of great importance in situations where moral and spiritual confusion prevail."[2] He describes the experience of gaining insight in these words:

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 152.

[2] Ibid.

> At times the flash of insight will light up a relatively small field with new meaning for the self who perceives it. At other times the insight will penetrate so far into the total field in which the self is involved as to cause one to feel that he has entered "a new world." And still other times the new insight will cause a shift within the self so radical as to give one the feeling and the conviction that a new self is coming into being.[3]

When the insight is accompanied by the feeling of seeing a new world or of discovering a new self, one is at the verge of changes in depth of the self. Sherrill finds that the principle of relationship is also supported by depth psychology whose generalization is summarized by him as: "the human self is formed in relationships; if it is de-formed, it is de-formed in relationships; and if it is re-formed, it is re-formed in relationships."[1] In his book Guilt and Redemption, Sherrill strongly if not exclusively stresses the importance of relationship in bringing out changes in persons. It is the oneness with the mother that makes an infant grow and continue to grow.[2] By receiving love from the mother and gratifying his emotional needs, one is able to grow into agape love.

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 154.

[2] Ibid., p. 155.

[3] Ibid., p. 156.

Sherrill advocates deeper changes in persons. It is through the accepting and trusting relationship between the therapist and the sufferer in going down "into this person's own little private hell" together that he is able to re-live the conflict which "has baffled him and defeated him" and finds something new taking place in his emotional career.[3] It is in the emotional relationship with the therapist and not in the rational comprehension of the nature of the suffering that therapy takes place. Rational comprehension of reasons why one feels guilty does not release him from guilt, because "the sense of guilt arose out of dynamic but malig-

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 157.

2. ________, Guilt and Redemption, p. 98.

3. Ibid., pp. 143-146.

nant relationships . . . ."[1] In order to heal the sense of guilt, one is to enter "another dynamic but controlled relationship with a suitable person." It is in relationships that deeper changes in persons take place. This is true not only in man's relationships with other human beings, but also in his relationship with God. The underlying principle is that the nature of responses which one makes "indicates the nature of changes taking place in the depths of the self," and that "the responses which are made point to the changes taking place in the relationship."

The changes which take place in persons can only be inferred and expressed in symbolic terms because there is a mysterious region in the self; be it the human self or the Divine Self. Sherrill believes that "the Spirit of God is present and participant in the interaction between the selves within the KOINONIA" and that "God in his Self-giving is constantly calling the self forward into newness and toward wholeness."[2] In one's total life experiences, changes in the self take place endlessly because the living God confronts man "not once only, but an endless number of times during his pilgrimage from infancy onward."

Sherrill's analysis of the dynamics of change in persons is very revealing. He points out that in the area of

---

1. Sherrill, Guilt and Redemption, p. 157.

2. ________, The Gift of Power, pp. 160-161.

one's relationships, there are interpersonal relationships and intrapsychic relationships. The former is the relationship with others, whereas the latter signifies the relationship with oneself. He stresses that "the early relationships are the first source of dynamic becasue they carry the power to form the character. . . ."[1] One's character structure functions as the channel which shapes the flow of his psychic energy.

The interpersonal relationships precede intrapsychic relationships and give shape to them. "The interpersonal relationships into which the individual is born give him his first feelings twoard himself. . .they begin to set up a relation between the 'I' and the 'me'."[2] The interpersonal tension is likely to stimulate intrapsychic tension, and vice versa. But experientially the former precedes the latter. The state of tension does not necessarily mean an unhealthful condition. It denotes that the self wants to change the state of things either in its intrapsychic relationships or in its interpersonal relationships. It is a condition "in which some capacity in the self is seeking a goal on which it can expend some or even all of its energy."[3] Tension can be truly creative. It can lead to changes in the self toward some goal, "which is neither a projection

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 165.

2. Ibid. 3. Ibid., p. 167.

of its own discontent nor a substitute to cover failure."[1]

In interpersonal relationships, one's motif is a dynamic factor in interaction because each person is likely to respond in fairly uniform ways when encountering other selves, and he has selective perception. But interaction can lead to change in personal motif and the pattern of selectivity in perception. When persons interact in true two-way communication, the change takes place without the feeling of threat to the self. When the interaction takes place at the deeper level, it is interpenetration; the giving self as it were enters into another self and becomes part of it and the receiving self takes into itself another in a process of introjection. As these go on, changes take place in persons.

Sherrill also points out another aspect of the dynamics of interaction, namely, the possibility of its becoming either spiritual or demonic. "Interaction is spiritual when it assists human selves to become what they were created to be."[2] It releases one from self-seeking. It makes one affirm the well-being of others. Sherrill believes that the living God is seeking unceasingly to "interpenetrate spiritually into the human selves and into their interaction in the Christian community."[3] This is the power of the

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 168.

[2] Ibid. p. 173.

[3] Ibid.

Spirit. The crux of the problem is whether the human self is willing to open and be responsive to this power or not. This power is a gift. "It is within man, yet it is the power of God."[1] It is the power of becoming!

Briefly, Sherrill strongly emphasizes the learner's participation and involvement in the educational process without discrediting the value of "telling" as a method of teaching in Christian education. He sees that the basic principle which underlies the teaching-learning process is two-way communication, which reflects God's revelation and human response. He advocates changes in depth which take place in persons in and through the "koinonia" of the Christian community.

---

1. Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 192.

# CHAPTER VII

# AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ELLIOTT'S VIEW OF MAN AND HIS PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The second step of this dissertation is to find the relationship between one's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education. It is to use his view of man as a search light and look into four major items in his philosophy of Christian education, namely, freedom and authority, objectives and content of Christian education, teaching methods and learning theory.

## 1. The Nature of Man in Relation to Freedom and Authority in Christian Education

First of all, we are to examine Elliott's view on freedom and authority in Christian education in the light of his conception of man in God's creation, sin and man's original nature, man's basic needs and human growth, and human knowledge.

### i. Freedom and Authority As Related to Man in God's Creation

Elliott is critical of the authoritarian type of Christian education. He repudiates any form of dogmatism and advocates a progressive type of education consistent with his strong faith in the individual right and freedom to read the Bible and to test any interpretation of the Christian faith for himself--the cardinal principle of the Reformation. For him, authority resides in the process of the interpretation of human experience, in the experimental process itself. The source of authority for Christian education is in the educational process because the ultimate determining agent is each individual person who participates in the process. "Elliott's declaration of his personal independence was not the ordinary declaration of a 'liberal'"[1] because he regards authority as something which resides within each person to enable him to exercise his autonomy and inner-directedness. For him authority is not something external, nor heteronomous. How is this concept related to his view of man in God's creation --man in his relation to God, to man and the universe?

Firstly, Elliott's autonomous view of authority is related to his "personality principle" which characterizes the unique nature of God and man, and the nature of the relationship between God and man. The loving personal relationship between God and man allows man to make decisions like a son and not a slave. Man is not to be

---

1. George A. Coe, "On Life, Work and Influence," Religious Education, Vol. XLVI, (Sept.-Oct., 1951), p. 264.

forced to obey God, nor to be manipulated by other human beings because he is a person. Elliott's strong emphasis on human responsibility and effort is related to his view of autonomous internal authority.

Secondly, Elliott's high regard for freedom, which characterizes the progressive type of education, can be justified by his understanding of man's worth and his optimistic view of man; man is high above everything else; he can be rational, capable of aesthetic and spiritual expression through the physical; he can be God's co-worker in the world. From this point of view, we can understand why Elliott advocates progressive education in the church. Man is too valuable to be used as a means for the propagation of any authoritative interpretation of the Christian faith. Man, whose worth and potentialities seem unlimited, is the center of Christian education. Thus, authority resides in the educational process itself, and not in any subject matter. Otherwise, the learner will be prevented from having a vital experience of his own.

Thirdly, Elliott's emphasis on internal autonomous authority is related to his concept of God's immanence, which influences his view of man and nature. Unlike the neo-orthodox interpreters of the Christian faith, he does not stress the transcendent aspect of God's nature and depict God as a sovereign ruler sitting on his throne which

3

is high up and remote from his people. On the contrary, Elliott emphasizes that God's rule is immanent in man and nature. Consequently, this leads to his view of authority--authority resides internally in man. This leads him further to see that authority is in the educational process itself.

It is evident that Elliott's view on freedom and authority in Christian education is related to his view of man in God's creation. But a question remains: In spite of the fact that Elliott strongly emphasizes the internal authority which resides in man and in the educational process itself, he acknowledges that a certain amount of external authority is needed to be the anchorage for youth to grow into maturity. How can this question be answered? It seems that one can find its answer in his cautious exposition of God's immanence, lest he should fall into the snare of pantheism. His caution seems to show a certain amount of acceptance of God's transcendence in his thinking. This would provide a ground for the recognition of external authority.

### ii. Freedom and Authority As Related to Sin and Man's Original Nature

How is Elliott's view of internal authority related to his concept of sin and man's original nature? This is the question we are concerned about now. It can be answered as follows.

Firstly, Elliott's view of internal authority is related to his denial of the existence of sin in general. From his point of view, sin can be discussed only in terms of sins which signify the actual performances of sinful action. Sin is a specific act. It is experiential. It is not something abstract. It is something concrete. This emphasis on the concreteness and specificity of sin is in harmony with his view of internal authority; the authority in Christian education is in the educational process itself.

Secondly, Elliott's view of internal authority is related to his cultural emphasis in the interpretation of sin. The differences in the interpretation of the meaning of sin are due to the differences in its cultural background. In the authoritarian culture, it is interpreted as rebellion, whereas in the democratic culture it is interpreted as pride or self-assertion. The neo-orthodox interpretation of sin reflects an authoritarian background. This cultural emphasis in the interpretation of sin is oriented to the process-centered, or experience-centered way of thinking.

Thirdly, Elliott's view of internal authority is related to his concept of man's original nature, which is not predetermined to good or evil. It is "a-moral" and neutral. He repudiates the neo-orthodox view of man's original nature, which stresses the sinfulness of man and his inability to do good. He questions the validity of theological determinism. Therefore, Elliott's view of man's original nature implies his basic concern for human freedom, the neutrality and plasticity of human personality. His view of man's original nature and his view of internal authority are on the same line.

Fourthly, Elliott's view of internal authority is connected with his differentiation of the sinner and the sick personality and his support for so-called sinners who are so often victims of social sin. His defense for those sufferers comes from his careful examination of the root of responsibility in those unfortunate cases. He is clear that the so-called sinners are not decision makers. The problem is beyond their control. Their suffering is not due to their exercise of their internal authority, namely, their freedom.

Thus, we can say that Elliott's view of freedom and authority in Christian education coincides with his view of sin and man's original nature.

### iii. Freedom and Authority As Related to Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth

From Elliott's discussion about man's basic needs and human growth we can also find their relationships with his emphasis on internal authority in Christian education.

He points out three important factors which are essential for personality development; 1) a sense of security, 2) success or achievement, and 3) warm social relationships--love and acceptance. The sense of security signifies the state of a person whose inner authority has enough strenght to combat the threat of, or assaults by external authority. The experience of success or achievement is a concrete expression of the victory of internal authority over external authority. Warm social relationships mean the peaceful harmony between internal authority and external authority. Both man's egoistic and social impulses are related to one's internal authority; the former is the assertion of internal authority whereas the latter is the extension and proper maintenance of internal authority.

Elliott also points out that in the process of human growth, each person strives to achieve independence, self-direction and protection during the first half of the life span and to achieve completion of life in his continual growth into maturity, in learning to work with others and to find satisfactions in the achievements of others, and in gradual yielding of responsibilities to the young generation during the last half of the life span. Generally, the process of man's growth during the period of the first half is centered on the "egoistic" impulse; whereas it is centered on the "social" or "unselfish" impulse during the period of second half. Thus, one can say that the process of man's growth during the first half of the life span is the birth and growth of internal authority at first, and then the assertion of internal authority in adolescence, and that the process of human growth during the last half of the life span is the extension and proper maintenance of internal authority. Therefore, it is imperative for Elliott to emphasize internal authority in Christian education. For him the authority in Christian education is in the educational process itself.

But Elliott's emphasis on the determinative influence of life experience during the first six years on one's personality pattern seems to affirm the priority of external authority to internal authority in the process of human growth. Even so, one can conclude that Elliott's view of freedom and authority in Christian education is coherently related to his view of man's basic needs and human growth.

### iv. Freedom and Authority As Related to Human Knowledge

Elliott's view of internal authority can also be supported by his view of human knowledge. He conceives of human knowledge as coming from human experience; be it the knowledge about God or knowledge about nature. All ideas are the interpretations of human experiences. From this perspective, it is logical for Elliott to see that the authority in Christian education resides in the process itself because subject matter per se is not effective unless it becomes an integral part of the educational process. The validity of abstract principles should be tested by human experience, and the authority to judge the validity of principles for life experience is subjective and internal.

Briefly, Elliott's view of freedom and authority is coherently related to his view of man; his emphasis on internal authority--individual freedom and autonomy, is in harmony with his view of man in God's creation, sin and man's original nature, man's basic needs and human growth, and human knowledge.

## 2. The Nature of Man in Relation to the Objectives of Christian Education

Our major task in this section is to examine the relationship between Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education and his view of man's nature. It is to find whether there is any point of contact between the two. It is to examine his view of the objectives of Christian education in the light of the major items in his view of man as in the previous section.

### i. Objectives of Christian Education As Related to Man in God's Creation

According to Elliott, the objectives of Christian education are different from those which are traditionally

9

held by the church which aims at the indoctrination of the authoritative interpretations of the Christian faith, the transmission of Biblical knowledge, the impartation of the historical Christian heritage, etc. For him, the purpose of Christian education is the reinterpretation and enrichment of the Christian faith by individuals and groups in and through the educational process aiming at the reconstruction of the society so as to build a society in which love is genuinely operative. How is this view related to his view of man in God's creation?

Firstly, Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education is related to his understanding of the nature of the relationship between God and man. The divine-human relationship is personal, as understood through the "personality principle." Man is a living personal being. This implies man's continual effort to understand God and God's continous revelation. Therefore, it is appropriate to aim at the reinterpretation and enrichment of the Christian faith by the individuals and groups in and through the educational process.

Secondly, Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education is related to his understanding of man's social nature. Man's social nature is justification for his emphasis on the social goal in Christian education, aiming at the building up of a co-operative society in which love is genuinely operative. Therefore, one can say that Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education is coherently related to the realization of his view of man's social nature and his dynamic nature as a person.

### ii. Objectives of Christian Education As Related to Sin and Man's Original Nature

How is Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education related to his concept of sin and man's original nature? This question can be answered from the perspectives of his emphses on the legitimate place of self-assertion, the cultural factor in the interpretation of sin, the amoral or neutral state of man's original nature.

Firstly, Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education is related to his view that self-assertion is not necessarily sin. Likewise, rebellion against an irrelevant interpretation of the Christian faith is not to be considered as sin. Often, the so-called sinners are sick personalities who have been deprived any opportunity for legitimate self-assertion. They have been oppressed. They are victims. They should be given opportunities for legitimate self-assertion; religiously, they should be given opportunities for the reinterpretation of the Christian faith for themselves in and through the educational process. The reinterpretation of the Christian faith includes not only the concept of sin, but also other elements in the

Christian faith.

Secondly, Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education is related to his view that the interpretation of sin is colored by differences in the interpreter's cultural background. In an authoritarian society, sin is interpreted as rebellion, whereas in the democratic society it is interpreted as egoism, pride and self-assertion. Christian education is carried out in various countries with different cultural backgrounds. Therefore, it is logical for Elliott to emphasize that the objective of Christian education is the reinterpretation and enrichment of the Christian faith by the individuals and groups in and through the educational process.

Thirdly, Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education is related to his view of man's original nature. Since man's original nature is amoral, there is an open possibility for either good or evil, or for both. This open possibility implies the necessity for aiming at a reinterpretation and enrichment of the Christian faith in and through the educational process. For those whose view of man's original nature is different from Elliott's, it is necessary for him to emphasize the reinterpretation of the Christian faith in conceiving the objectives of Christian education.

Thus, it is safe to say that Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education is coherently related to his concept of sin and man's original nature.

### iii. Objectives of Christian Education As Related to Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth

It is not too difficult to determine the relationship between Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education and his understanding of man's basic needs and human growth.

Firstly, when Christian education aims at the learner's reinterpretation of the Christian faith, it aims at the satisfaction of one's egoistic, or selfish need. The act of the reinterpretation of the Christian faith is an expression of one's ego strength, or the development of autonomy. Likewise, the social goal in Christian education aims at the satisfaction of man's social need, or unselfish need. Therefore, we can say that Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education is very appropriate in the light of his understanding of man's basic needs.

Secondly, the process of human growth is divided into several stages with their respective characteristics and problems. The Christian faith is interpreted differently, according to one's stage of growth, one's past experience, and one's cultural background. From this point of view, one has to reinterprete the Christian faith again and again in order to find a meaningful way of life, as one grows from infancy to adulthood, and from adulthood to middle age, and from middle age to old age. From the cognitive point of view, Elliott's emphasis on the reinterpretation of the Christian faith corresponds with stages of human growth.

Thirdly, Elliott's social goal in Christian education aims at a society which is most conducive to providing warm loving relationships for a healthy development of personality. From the affective point of view, Elliott's emphasis on the social goal in Christian education corresponds with human growth needs.

Therefore, we can say that Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education and his understanding of man's basic needs and human growth are integrally related to each other.

### iv. Objectives of Christian Education As Related to Human Knowledge

How is Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education related to his view of human knowledge? This question can be answered from two perspectives; his Johanine position with regard to the pertinence of human knowledge to the interpretation of the Christian faith and his concept of the source of human knowledge.

Like Origen and Thomas Aquinas, Elliott does not deny the pertinence of human knowledge to the interpretation of the Christian faith. Since there have been changes in human knowledge, it is inevitable that the Christian faith should be reinterpreted in the light of new knowledge man has acquired.

From Elliott's point of view, human knowledge comes out of human experience, be it knowledge about God or knowledge about nature. The source of human knowledge is human experience. Every man has his own unique life experience because of his inborn equipment, family background, and his particular cultural background. Each group has its own ethnical, cultural, national, geographical, and historical background. This makes it necessary to reinterpret the Christian faith by the individuals and groups for themselves in the light of their unique experiences. In the course of reinterpretation, the Christian faith can be enriched.

Elliott's social goal for Christian education may be understood to be the affective aspect of the educational objectives, whereas the reinterpretation of the Christian faith is primarily the cognitive one. Therefore, one may be tempted to ignore the relationship between the social goal and human knowledge. But in fact, the social goal has its cognitive elements. The affective and the cognitive are inseparable.

Thus, one can say that Elliott's view of the objectives of Christian education is coherently related to his view of man.

### 3. The Nature of Man in Relation to the Content of Christian Education

We now turn to the relationship between Elliott's view of the content of Christian education and his view of the nature of man. Following the procedure of the previous sections we are to examine his ideas about the educational content in the light of his concept of man in God's creation, sin and man's original nature, man's basic needs and human growth, and human knowledge.

#### i. The Content of Christian Education As Related to Man in God's Creation

Elliott sees that the content of Christian education is not a prefixed authoritarian interpretation of the Christian faith. It includes the Bible, the Christian heritage, the present life situation, and the testimonies of teachers, parents and other Christians. The life situation provides problems and the Bible is a resource, together with other living testimonies, for the learner to utilize in working out a meaningful solution for himself. How is this view related to Elliott's view of man in God's creation?

The point of contact between the two is the flexible dynamic nature which is so essential both for man as a person and for the un-prefixed content of Christian education. The relationship between God and man is personal; so also is the relationship between the learner and the teacher. The content of Christian education changes according to the persons who are involved in the educational process. The Bible is not the only resource from which one draws content materials for Christian education because it is limited to the record of the past. There should be resource materials which are contemporaneous to the learner. The basic root of the dynamic nature of the content of Christian education lies in its being contemporaneous to the learner.

Although the Bible is a static, non-living entity, the interpretations about the faith it contains are numberous and diversified. There is no authoritative interpretation of the Christian faith which it is the task of Christian education to transmit from one generation to another. The diversity of the interpretation of the Christian faith is rooted in the dynamic nature of the interpreter as a person.

Thus, we can say that Elliott's view of the content of Christian education is related to his view of man in God's creation, and the point of contact is the flexible dynamic nature of the two.

### ii. The Content of Christian Education As Related to Sin and Man's Original Nature

The relationship between Elliott's view of the content of Christian education and his understanding of sin and man's original nature can be seen as follows.

Firstly, Elliott does not formulate his concept of sin and man's original nature apart from the Bible, though he has great confidence in scientific knowledge. He includes the Bible in his list of resources for the content of Christian education as an important one, though not the central one. Therefore, the Bible can be a point of contact between his view of the educational content and his concept of sin and man's original nature.

Secondly, Elliott emphasizes the cultural factor in the interpretation of the meaning of sin; as we have seen in the authoritarian society, sin means rebellion, whereas in the democratic society sin means pride, self-assertion or egoism. For him, sin is not a general idea. Sin is a concrete act. This emphasis on concreteness and culture is also expressed in Elliott's great concern for the life situation of the learner in his view of the content of Christian education.

Thirdly, Elliott's emphasis on life situations in the educational content is related to his differentiation of sinners and sick personalities and his criticism of the superficiality of the treatment of the problem of sin both by Protestants and Roman Catholics. The inclusion of the life situation of the learner in the content of Christian education seems to be the best solution.

Fourthly, the emphasis on life situations in the educational content helps us create a kind of mentality which can easily accept Elliott's view of man's original nature--being amoral and neutral. On the other hand, his view of man's original nature needs the support of the life situation-centered emphasis in the content of Christian education.

### iii. The Content of Christian Education As Related to Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth

How is Elliott's view of the content of Christian education related to his view of man's basic needs and human growth? It seems that the relationship between the two is not very evident. Yet, it can be analyzed as follows.

Firstly, Elliott sees that although the Bible and the past heritage of the church are to be utilized as resources for planning the content of the educational process, they are by no means fixed or authoritative. Therefore the educational content can be flexible to meet the problems of the learner in each stage of human growth. Elliott acknowledges that one can not work out his solutions in a vacuum. One should reflect upon the Bible and the heritage from the past, as well as the convictions and beliefs shared by teachers and other mature persons. This sharing of convictions and beliefs by the teacher will make the educational content cognitively and affectively relevant to the needs of the learner.

Secondly, the emphasis on life situations in the educational content has great significance for making Christian education existentially relevant to the learner's life experience at each specific stage of human growth. If the educational content does not take into account the life situations of the learner, it tends to become either theologically too generalized to answer the specific problems of his existential situation, or too remote from the learner's concern to be of any assistance to him.

The difficulty in finding the relationship between Elliott's view of the content of Christian education and his view of man's basic needs and human growth comes from the fact that the former tends to be cognitively oriented, whereas the latter tends to be affectively oriented. It is difficult directly to relate the two.

### iv. The Content of Christian Education As Related to Human Knowledge

How is Elliott's view of the content of Christian education related to his concept of human knowledge?

This question can likewise be answered from the point of view of his emphasis on life situations in the content of Christian education.

According to Elliott, human knowledge comes out of human experience of the past and the present; human experience is not something which takes place in a vacuum. On the contrary, it is always in a concrete life situation. Therefore, the relationship between his view of human knowlege and his emphasis on life situations in the educational content is obvious.

Furthermore, Elliott's emphasis on life situations is in harmony with his liberal position, which recognizes the pertinence of human knowledge in the interpretation of the Christian faith, incorporating secular terminology and thought from ordinary life experience.

Finally, our attention needs to be focused on Elliott's view of the Bible and its relationship to his concept of human knowledge. He does not regard the Bible as the direct revelation of God, nor accept the possibility of God's direct ruling of the universe. The Bible is the record of human reflections and interpretations of God's manifestations in human experiences and nature. The Bible is related to the experiences of God's people in the Old Testament period and the New Testament period. It is in human experience that we find the relationship of Elliott's concept of human knowledge and the Bible which he regards to be an indispensible resource for the content of Christian education.

Thus, we can say that Elliott's view of the content of Christian education is coherently related to his concept of human knowledge.

### 4. The Nature of Man in Relation to Teaching Methods and Learning Theory

In this section, we are to examine the relationship between Elliott's view of man and his view of teaching methods and learning theory. The procedure follows the same pattern used thus far.

#### i. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory As Related to Man in God's Creation

Being dissatisfied with the Herbartian method, Elliott became interested in the group thinking process based on daily problems, following the insights he had from John Dewey's How We Think. He is convinced that the dualism between subject matter and life experience can be and needs to be overcome, and that the method to overcome this dualism is the group thinking process, which is based on life situations and not on pre-determined principles which are to be applied to life situations. His axiomatic expression about learning is: Man learns in and through experience. How is this related to his understanding of man in God's creation?

Firstly, the Herbartian method seems to presuppose the value of principles and subject matter above the value of man. Man is not the master of the principle; on the contrary, man is to serve the principle and becomes its means. But from Elliott's point of view, this is absurd. Man is of supreme value. He is the master of the principle and subject matter and not vice versa. Principles are creations of man out of his experiences. Nothing can be above man except God. Principles and subject matters are to be used by man in solving life problems which are faced in one's actual living. The method of the group thinking process presupposes the idea that man is a self-determining agent. He is given freedom to choose this principle and discard that principle because man is a personal being. Therefore, we can say that the method of the group thinking process is based on Elliott's "personality principle" and his high regard for human value.

Secondly, the group thinking process requires participation, involvement, action and evaluation of the solution of problems on the part of the learner. The effective group thinking process takes place in good-will and honest encounter one with the other in expressing one's own viewpoint and ideas. This is based on the conviction that man is a social being who can not exist in a state of absolute isolation. He is always in personal relationships with others. This is another aspect of Elliott's "personality principle" which is so cardinal in his thinking.

Thirdly, Elliott emphasizes that life situations should be the initial concern in planning the educational process. This follows from his high regard for the individuality and uniqueness of each learner. Elliott's theory of learning also reveals his strong existential concern; man learns in and through experience.

Therefore, we can say that Elliott's view of teaching methods and learning theory is coherently related to his view of man in God's creation.

### ii. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory As Related to Sin and Man's Original Nature

Is there any relationship between Elliott's view of teaching methods and learning theory and his concept of sin and man's original nature? If there is, what is it?

From Elliott's point of view, the use of the Herbartian method does not coincide with his concept of sin and man's original nature just as it does not fit his view of man as a person with freedom to determine his own destiny. The use of the Herbartian method would tend to deal with the problem of sin in a generalized abstract way. But Elliott does not see the existence of sin as such. Sin can only be understood in terms of concrete sinful acts, "sins." This shows that Elliott's dissatisfaction with the Herbartian method is related to his interpretation of sin. Instead of the Herbartian method, he advocates the life situation approach and the group thinking process which deal with the problem of sin situationally, concretely, and co-operatively.

This life situation approach does not start from a predetermined view of man's original nature. It starts with real life situations of all kinds. It does not presuppose a pessimistic view of man's original sin, nor the optimistic view of man's original nature as being good. The presupposition of the life situation approach is neutral. Therefore, it is in harmony with Elliott's view of man's original nature as being amoral and neutral. Man can become good and/or evil. The outcome depends on life experience. Elliott also sees that the sense of guilt comes from social disapproval, and differs from one culture to another. This coincides with Elliott's theory of learning; man learns the sense of guilt in and through experience.

Thus, we can say that Elliott's view of teaching methods and theory of learning is coherently related to his concept of sin and man's original nature.

### iii. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory As Related to Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth

Elliott sees the importance of the emotional factor in the group thinking process. It is not something added at the end but is an integral part of the process. He stresses the necessity of the member's personal presence, willingness to participate, frankness, good-will, variety in conviction and yet unity in spirit and fellowship, eagerness to search, and the sense of commitment and loyalty. These are important factors for a good group thinking process. At the same time, these factors are related to man's "egoistic impulse" and "social impulse"--needs for security, love, acceptance and success or achievement. Therefore, one may conclude that the group thinking process is a method by which man's basic needs are satisfied and healthy personality development is facilitated. His learning theory reminds us of the concern for the learner's experience; his basic needs and problems at each particular stage of human growth.

In the first half of the life span, the major problem is to grow into maturity; to obtain self-direction and self-protection, to become independent and to assume full responsibility for oneself. The group thinking process which is geared to life situations provides a setting in which one's independence and the ability to assume full responsibility can be developed. In the second half of the life span, one has to learn to rejoice and work in and through others and to yield responsibilities to the next generation. The group thinking process is a means by which one can develop his ability in building interpersonal relationships and to complete the learning-task of inter-dependence.

But the limitations of the group thinking process should not be neglected. At least, there is a period in which the group thinking process can not take place fully or even at all. It is the infancy period when one is still dependent on the parents and the self has not emerged enough to participate in group thinking. The group thinking process may be applicable to some extent for the parents and the bigger children at home.

Therefore, one can say that Elliott's view of man's basic needs and human growth is coherently related to his theory of learning and teaching methods.

### iv. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory As Related to Human Knowledge

Elliott's group thinking process is based on his theory of learning. He points out that man learns in and through experience. At the same time, he is convinced that human knowledge comes from human experience. All ideas have grown out of human experience and are conclusions of the interpretation of what man has experienced. Whether it is scientific knowledge, or ethical knowledge, or knowledge about God, all knowledge derives from human experience. Elliott's emphasis on life situations in planning the educational process is also related to human experience. Therefore, we can say that Elliott's teaching methods, theory of learning and his concept of human knowledge are all integrally related to human experience.

Briefly, we can summarize our analysis of the relationship between Elliott's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education by saying that the basic concepts which underlie the two are his "personality principle" and his "experience principle." Man is the starting point in his understanding of man and his philosophy of Christian education. There is no super-naturalism in his thought. On the whole, Elliott's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education are integrally and coherently related to each other.

# CHAPTER VIII

# AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHERRILL'S VIEW OF MAN AND HIS PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Having analyzed the thought of Elliott, we now turn to the analysis of the relationship between Sherrill's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education. Following the pattern of the previous chapter, we are to examine his understanding of man in God's creation, sin and man's original nature, man's basic needs and human growth in relation to his view of freedom and authority in Christian education, the objectives and content of Christian education, teaching methods and learning theory.

## 1. The Nature of Man in Relation to Freedom and Authority in Christian Education

First of all, we are to examine Sherrill's view of freedom and authority in the light of his view of man, and see how the two are related to each other.

### i. Freedom and Authority As Related to Man in God's Creation

In studying Sherrill's educational thought, we can hardly miss his great concern for individual freedom, liberty of spirit, and personal autonomy. But he is not uncautious of the extreme freedom which leads to chaos and disaster. From his point of view, the ultimate basis of authority in Christian education is God's revelation and man's response. He is convinced that Christian education is "not God-centered, nor is it man-centered. It is bi-polar; that is, it is concerned with the meeting between God and the human creature." Therefore, the determining factor in Christian education is the relationship between God and man. How is this related to Sherrill's view of man in God's creation?

In his discussion about man, Sherrill finds the doctrine of the "Image Dei" to be a significant symbolic representation from which he derives two important aspects of man; 1) his creatureliness,which shows his kinship with other creatures, 2) his unique relationship with God which puts him higher than the rest of God's creation, because man only is personal, and is a "self-determining creature."

Human creatureliness makes it clear that man is finite. Therefore, human freedom is likewise finite. Consequently, Sherrill finds it a great danger to absolutize one's own ideas in the name of divine inspiration in order to dominate others. This is as bad as dead conformity. This is as undesirable as to make education a process of developing habits.

But man's unique relationship with God makes it necessary for Sherrill to emphasize individual freedom and autonomy in the educational process and the intrinsic nature of authority within each person. He warns us not to let the educational process degenerate into a kind of subtle manipulation of the learner by the teacher.

Here Sherrill's two emphases seem to be in conflict with each other; the internal authority versus the bi-polar authority of the divine-human relationship. In fact this is not so. According to Sherrill, the process of the appropriation of God's revelation and human perception of the revelation are both internal. Without this internalizing process, God's revelation does not have any significant effect on the person. The process of this internalization is subjective. But it is a relational process. It is bi-polar by the very nature of the divine-human relationship. This is the basis for the bi-polarity in Christian education.

### ii. Freedom and Authority As Related to Sin and Man's Original Nature

From Sherrill's point of view, sin is the breakdown of relationships which results in basic inner conflict, with the demonic element operating in man and his society. How is this related to his view of freedom and authority in Christian education?

Firstly, it is not difficult to see that Sherrill's emphasis on the human right of self-determination and the bi-polarity in Christian education is related to his concept of sin. He regards the manipulative type of educational process as demonic because it violates the learner's internal authority and breaks the bi-polarity of the relationship. The process becomes the absorption of the weaker self by the stronger self. Domination of others means the breakdown of relationships. This violates the principle of human values. It is against the law of love. It leads to a malignant relationship. Sherrill's concept of sin gives support to his view of the internal, bi-polar authority.

Secondly, Sherrill's awareness of the existence of the demonic element in man does not allow him to support an optimistic view of education. His concept of man's original nature prevents him from falling into the extreme emphasis on the internal authority of the learner. On the one hand, he emphasizes the individual's freedom and autonomy, but on the other hand, he can not ignore the basic conflict in man. Perhaps, this basic conflict in man is a reason for Sherrill to emphasize the bi-polarity in Christian education. It is not God-centered, nor is it man-centered. It is in tension, which symbolizes in some way the inner conflict of man.

The point of contact between Sherrill's view of freedom and authority and his concept of sin and man's original nature is his concern for relationships--divine-human relationship, inter-personal relationship and intrapsychic relationship.

### iii. Freedom and Authority As Related to Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth

What then is the relationship between Sherrill's view of freedom and authority and his view of man's basic needs and human growth?

Firstly, Sherrill's emphasis on individual freedom and autonomy is in harmony with his concept of man's basic needs. He points out that one of man's basic needs is to become an individual person with the sense of dignity and to be free from any external domination. This need cries for fulfilment right from early childhood in the process of human growth. The central problem in childhood is that of individuation. It is even more evident in the adolescent period whose central problem is "to be psychologically weaned" from the parents in order to attain independence. One's autonomy is expressed in his effort to achieve basic identifications in young adulthood, in the effort to achieve an integrated philosophy of life in middle age, and in the process of simplification during the period of old age. Simplification in old age can be seen as the process of crystallization of the core of one's self and the achievement of the greatest degree of spiritual autonomy and freedom.

Secondly, Sherrill's emphasis on the bi-polarity in Christian education can be related to his emphasis on the effort to keep in balance and equiribrium both togetherness and separateness. We want not only the fulfilment of the need to become an individual person but also the fulfilment of the need to identify with something greater and stronger than ourselves. To meet the one need at the expense of the other is bound to create threats to the existing self. One will feel either being absorbed by others or being isolated from others. One will feel either the loss of oneself or being overwhelmed with loneliness and anxiety. The bi-polarity in Christian education is significant from the point of view of inner equiribrium.

Thirdly, we may find that the need to identify with something greater and stronger than oneself is not related to the internal authority of each person, namely, individual freedom and autonomy. In fact, it is not so. The need to identify with something greater and stronger than oneself is the desire for an outward manifestation of inward autonomy and freedom without which there is no opportunity for the expression of individual freedom and autonomy. Therefore, the two are actually one.

Thus, we can say that Sherrill's view of freedom and authority is coherently related to his view of man's basic needs and human growth.

## iv. Freedom and Authority As Related to Human Knowledge

Although we can not find particularly convincing relationships between Sherrill's view of freedom and authority and his view of human knowledge, the following two areas seem to deserve out attention.

Firstly, Sherrill's emphasis on individual freedom and autonomy in the educational process seems to have correlation with his view of perception and man's knowledge of God. From this point of view, man's knowledge of God and moral knowledge are inevitably conditioned by one's life experience with the parents at home and associates beyond the family circle. Since each person has his unique experience with his parents and associates, everyone has his particular view of God and way of perception. This uniqueness and particularity of each person can well be regarded as the expression and the result of individual autonomy.

Secondly, Sherrill's view of bi-polarity in Christian education seems to relate to the fact that he draws resources from non-Christian religions and the so-called secular fields--psychology, philosophy, education, history and other branches of science in formulating his new philosophy of Christian education. He does not reject these sources of human knowledge, although he is convinced that Christian education should draw "its inspiration from the peculiar genius of the Christian community and of Christian faith rather than from any form of secular society or secular education." On the contrary, Sherrill acknowledges that we have very much to learn from such sources, "and we shall repeatedly acknowledge the debt."[1] This shows Sherrill's inner tension and dilemma which can be seen as the expression of his bi-polar thinking.

Thus, we can say that Sherrill's view of individual freedom and autonomy, and the bi-polar emphasis, are coherently related to his view of man.

### 2. The Nature of Man in Relation to the Objectives of Christian Education

For the sake of convenience, our analysis of the relationship between Sherrill's view of man and his understanding of the objectives of Christian education will be focused on the statement he made in his later years concerning the nature of Christian education. It reads:

> Christian education is the attempt, ordinarily by members of the Christian community, to participate in and to guide the changes which take place in persons in their relationships with God, with the church, with other persons, with the physical world, and with oneself.[2]

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. xi.

[2] Ibid., p. 82.

### i. Objectives of Christian Education As Related to Man in God's Creation

From Sherrill's point of view, Christian education aims at "the changes which take place in persons in their relationship with God, with the church, with other persons, with the physical world and with oneself." How is this related to his understanding of man in God's creation?

Firstly, it should be noted that "relationship" is the point of contact between the two. Christian education is concerned about the change of relationships, the change of persons in depth. Man's unique relationship with God and man's creatureliness are the two concepts which the doctrine of the "Imago Dei" symbolically represents. The multi-relationships which Christian education aims to change show exactly where man stands in God's creation. Being created in the image of God, man is related to God, to other fellow human beings, to the physical world, and to oneself, because man is able to transcend himself and to look at himself as an object. Man's creatureliness shows his kinship with the rest of the physical world. Man is related to his fellow human beings because of his social nature.

Secondly, it is the concept of change which links Sherrill's view of man in God's creation and his understanding of the objectives of Christian education. The former emphasizes the change of relationships whereas the latter specify the unique nature of man's relationship with God--the dynamic nature of personal relationship. It changes according to man's willful decision in response to God. Since the relationships of man presuppose his freedom and self-determination, Sherrill avoids any highly specific statement about the educational objectives lest it should lead to predetermining the behavior and feelings of the learner and manipulation by the teacher.

Thus we can say that Sherrill's view of man in God's creation and his view of the objectives of Christian education are coherently related to his concept of "relationship" and change.

### ii. Objectives of Christian Education As Related to Sin and Man's Original Nature

How is Sherrill's view of the objectives of Christian education related to his understanding of sin and man's original nature? This question can be dealt with from two perspectives.

Firstly, Sherrill is neither in favor of the highly specific type of the educational objectives nor the open-ended type of education. He chooses the middle way. The reason why Sherrill is not a supporter of the open-ended type of education is that he takes seriously the existence of the demonic element in man. There is always the possibility for human intelligence to turn toward the demonic direction. His criticism of the open-ended type of education is based on the fact that its presupposed view of man is too optimistic to recognize the demonic element in man. This shows how Sherrill's approach to the educational objectives is influenced by his understanding of sin and man's original nature.

Secondly, sin is the breakdown of relationships; the divine-human relationship and interpersonal relationships. Man's basic inner conflict shows the breakdown of intra-psychic relationships, i.e., the relationship with oneself. Hostility arises out of malignant relationships and is the seed-bed of sin. Wherever there is distrust, misunderstanding, jealousy, hatred, the breakdown of the law of love, there is sin. Man's basic conflict is also concerned about the disharmony with God, with others, and with the world. For the solution of the problem of sin and man's original nature, it is logical for Sherrill to set the educational objectives in terms of the change of relationships.

Thus, we can say that Sherrill's view of sin and man's original nature is coherently related to his understanding of the objectives of Christian education, and also to his approach to the educational objectives in general.

✓

### iii. Objectives of Christian Education As Related to Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth

Sherrill sees that man's basic needs are two: 1) the need to become an individual person, and 2) the need to identify with something stronger and greater than oneself. It is significant that both are in the area of relationship. It is within the context of personal relationships that these basic needs are met. They can not be met in a vacuum. Furthermore, they can not be met in a life situation in which man's relationships become malignant and broken. Therefore, for the satisfaction of man's basic needs Christian educators should aim at the changes which take place in persons in their relationships with God, with others, with the church, with the physical world and with oneself.

Sherrill sees that the process of human growth is a process of change in personal relationships; 1) individuation in childhood, 2) being psychologically weaned from the parents in adolescence, 3) basic identifications in young adulthood, 4) integration of one's acquired philosophy of life and his spontaneous philosophy of life in middle age adulthood, and 5) simplification of life in old age adulthood. All have something to do with personal relationship in one way or another. Therefore, for the completion of the developmental tasks in each stage of human growth Christian educators should aim at the changes which take place in persons in their relationships in various dimensions.

Sherrill conceives that the purpose of the use of the Bible is the "continuing encounter" between God and man. Human growth is a continuous process. Therefore, the two should be in harmony. In one's life span, there is more than one crisis in which one is confronted by God. Furthermore, Sherrill's view that human growth is a continuous process is also in harmony with his approach to educational objectives. Because human growth is a continuous process, it is not desirable to have a highly specified statement of the objectives of Christian education. It is hardly possible to state clearly and distinctively what should happen in one's confrontation by God from infancy to old age. God's confrontation of man and man's response to God are very dynamic, personal and existential.

Thus, we can say that Sherrill's view of man's basic needs and human growth is coherently related to his view of the objectives of Christian education.

### iv. Objectives of Christian Education As Related to Human Knowledge

It seems that there are two points which deserve our attention in our analysis of the relationship between

Sherrill's view of the objectives of Christian education and his concept of human knowledge.

Firstly, Sherrill sees that one's knowledge of God is colored by his image of the earthly father and his image of the earthly father is conditioned by the parent-child relationship. If the child is fortunate enough to have a loving father and mother and to experience genuine love, he encounters God because "God is in that parental love." Therefore, the changes which take place in persons in their relationships will result in changes in human knowledge because human knowledge comes from human learning and human learning takes place in inter-personal relationships. Again, the point of contact is the change of relationships.

Secondly, Sherrill sees that the change of one's relationship with the physical world is also a part of the objectives of Christian education. His concept of human knowledge implies a good relationship with the physical world. He does not reject human knowledge. On the contrary, he acknowledges our indebtedness to the secular fields. Therefore, Sherrill's Johanine concept of human knowledge justifies his view of the objectives of Christian education which include the change of one's relationship with the physical world.

Thus, we can say that Sherrill's view of the objectives of Christian education is coherently related to his concept of human knowledge.

## 3. The Nature of Man in Relation to the Content of Christian Education

We now move on to the analysis of the relationship between Sherrill's view of man and his view of the content of Christian education. As has been indicated previously, he formulates his philosophy of Christian education from the point of view of God's revelation. The two major sources for the content of Christian education are the Bible and the Christian community. Because of his emphasis on the continuing-encounter between God and man, and because of his awareness of the contribution of secular knowledge, he does not leave out the relevant non-Biblical materials in determining the content of Christian education. The educational content is not fixed for all situations. In view of man's response to God and his perception of God's revelation, scientific knowledge about the Bible and human nature, and life situations are important elements to be considered for educational content. How is this related to his view of man?

### i. The Content of Christian Education As Related to Man in God's Creation

In the discussion about man in God's creation, we find that Sherrill derives two important concepts from the symbolic representation--man being created in the image of God; 1) man's creatureliness and 2) man's uniqueness. How is this related to his view of the content of Christian education?

Firstly, the point of contact can be found from the concept of man's uniqueness. Man has a unique relationship with God. Without this unique relationship, there is no revelation of God to man, nor man's response to God. Without God's revelation and human response, there would be neither the Bible, nor the Christian community, because both are based on and bear witness to God's revelation. Therefore, the Bible and the Christian community are two major elements in the content of Christian education. For the search for meaning and the fulfilment of man's social nature, the Bible and the Christian community are indispensible.

Secondly, man's uniqueness is his dynamic nature. His unique relationship with God is personal because both God and man are personal beings. Man is created as a "self-determining creature" who makes responses to God in nonmechanistic ways. Therefore, it is logical for Sherrill to emphasize the flexibility and the unpredetermined nature of the content of Christian education. Just as the objectives of Christian education can not be highly specific, so also the content of Christian education can not be fixed.

Thirdly, the point of contant can be found from man's creatureliness. Because of his creatureliness, man is finite and is limited in time and space, a concrete life situation. He lives in the world together with the rest of God's creation. Therefore, it is necessary to include scientific knowledge and life situations in determining the content of Christian education.

Thus, we can say that Sherrill's view of man in God's creation and his view of the content of Christian education are coherently related to each other.

### ii. The Content of Christian Education As Related to Sin and Man's Original Nature

Sherrill sees that sin is the breakdown of relationships and that man's original nature is known from its inner conflict and the existence of the demonic element in man. Sin and mental illness should be differentiated. How is this related to his view of the content of Christian education?

Firstly, the Bible and the Christian community are the major sources from which Sherrill draws his ideas about sin and its solution. The restoration of the broken relationships is through the revelation of God and human response to which the Bible and the Christian community bear witness. Therefore, the Bible and the Christian community are two major sources for the content of Christian education.

Secondly, Sherrill points out the necessity of distinguishing the problem of sin and the problem of sick personality in the stories of those who were tormented by the morbid sense of guilt. This is due to his psychological insight. In his search for an accurate understanding of man's original nature, he also draws knowledge from the non-Biblical sources, particularly from psychology. Because of his psychological insight, Sherrill is able to detect the non-theological factors hidden in the supposedly theological matter. For example, he sees the psychological meaning in the spiritual struggles of Augustine and Luther.[1] Therefore, it is natural for Sherrill to emphasize the importance of the relevant scientific knowledge and life situations in determining the content of Christian education.

Thirdly, in view of Sherrill's relational interpretation of the meaning of sin--sin is the breakdown of relationships, his emphasis on the "relational content"--the Christian community has special significance and relevance.

Thus, we can say that Sherrill's view of the content of Christian education is coherently related to his concept of sin and man's original nature.

---

1. Sherrill refers to Augustine's closeness to his mother and the harshness, or even the brutality of Luther's parents. See, The Struggle of the Soul, p. 112.

### iii. The Content of Christian Education As Related to Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth

The relationship between Sherrill's view of the content of Christian education and his view of man's basic needs and human growth can be traced as follows:

Firstly, Sherrill sees that man's basic needs are the need to become an individual person and the need to identify with something greater and stronger than oneself. Sherrill considers the Christian community to be an important component of the content of Christian education. The Christian community is characterized by its "koinonia" in which one finds love and acceptance. The Christian fellowship provides the context in which one is given love and acceptance to become an individual person and to identify with others. This "relational" content--the Christian community--satisfies the basic needs of man.

Secondly, Sherrill sees that there are five stages in the total life span and there is a central problem in each stage. The Christian community can directly and indirectly help its members accomplish their developmental tasks in each stage; individuation in childhood, psychological weaning in adolescence, basic identifications in young adulthood, achieving a mature view of life and the universe in middle age adulthood, and simplification in old age adulthood.

Thirdly, the Bible and scientific knowledge are oriented to satisfy man's needs and his growth from the cognitive and intellectual point of view whereas the Christian community is oriented to satisfy man's needs and his growth from the affective and emotional point of view. Through the study of the Bible and the secular knowledge about man and the world, one is helped to formulate his ego-ideal, his philosophy of life and a view of the universe, and to achieve intellectual independence along with emotional independence; the Bible and the secular knowledge about man and the world are used to formulate the cognitive content of Christian education for the intellectual growth in faith.

Fourthly, Sherrill's emphasis on the unpredetermined nature of the content of Christian education is in harmony with his view of human growth. Although there are five stages in the total life span, every one is unique in the growing process. Therefore, the educational content should be flexible to meet the needs and the stages of growth of the learner.

Thus, we can say that Sherrill's view of the content of Christian education is coherently related to his understanding of man's basic needs and human growth.

Our discussion about the relationship between the cognitive growth in faith and the Bible leads us to the next step in discussing Sherrill's view of human knowledge and its relationship to the content of Christian education.

### iv. The Content of Christian Education As Related to Human Knowledge

Sherrill does not reject human knowledge. On the contrary, he sees its high value and contributions to the solution of human problems, particularly the value of psychology, psychiatry, and other social sciences. But he also sees the limitation of science and how man's moral concept and his knowledge of God are influenced by his life experience. Has this anything to do with his view of the content of Christian education?

Firstly, because Sherrill sees the limitation of human knowledge and does not idolize scientific discoveries, it is inevitable for him to emphasize God's revelation to which the Bible and the Christian community bear witness, and for which even "the latest results of scientific study" can not be substituted. The Bible and the Christian community are the two major sources for the content of Christian education.

Secondly, because Sherrill does not reject the high value and contributions of human knowledge to the solution of human problems, he sees that religion, psychology and sociology have the same goal in respect to marriage and family life, and that scientific knowledge about man and the world is an important source for the content of Christian education.

Thirdly, because Sherrill sees that man's moral knowledge and his knowledge of God is colored by his life experience, it is necessary to have scientific knowledge about the life experience of the people in the Bible in order to have an accurate understanding of their knowledge of God and their moral knowledge. It is also necessary to have the Christian community as a major component of the educational content in order to provide corrective life experiences for those unfortunate ones whose knowledge of God and their moral knowledge have been distorted by their unhappy experiences. Therefore, scientific knowledge about the Bible and its people--Biblical criticism and archeology, etc. is an important source for the content of Christian education as well as the Christian community.

Thus, we can say that Sherrill's view of human knowledge is coherently related to his view of the content of Christian education.

### 4. The Nature of Man in Relation to Teaching Methods and Learning Theory

With regard to teaching methods and learning theory, Sherrill points out the importance of the learner's participation, involvement, identification, perception, and sharing of experience. He emphasizes two-way communication, the ultimacy of the "koinonia" and the divine participation in relationships. He is in favor of the principle of learning by insight and depth changes in persons. He sees that the incentive for the learner to participate in the educational process should not result from the competitive spirit but from one's own ego-ideal which creates the desire to improve oneself. He acknowledges the effectiveness of non-verbal communication and also the place of "telling" in Christian education. But basically, teaching and learning take place in and through personal relationships. Therefore, education of the emotions precedes education for the mind. The inter-personal relationships precede the intrapsychic relationships. How are these related to his view of man?

### i. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory As Related to Man in God's Creation

Sherrill sees two important concepts about man in God's creation; 1) man's creatureliness, 2) man's uniqueness. These two concepts have great relevance and significance for his teaching methods and learning theory.

Firstly, because Sherrill sees that man is created as a "self-determinative creature" it is logical for him to emphasize the importance of learner's participation, involvement, and to point out the weakness of conditioned responses and trial and error theories of learning which tend to underestimate the sense of human selfhood. Likewise, it is logical for him to support the principle of learning by insight and depth changes in persons.

Secondly, because Sherrill sees that man has a unique relationship with God--an I-Thou relationship--which is two way and personal, it is logical for him to emphasize two-way communication, the ultimacy of the "koinonia" and the divine participation in relationships. Likewise, it is logical for him to see the effectiveness of non-verbal communication, and the priority of interpersonal relationships to intrapsychic relationships.

Thirdly, because Sherrill sees the unique place of man in God's creation, it is logical for him to emphasize that the incentive for the learner to participate should not result from the competitive spirit but from the ego-ideal, the noble self-image. It is man who is created in the image of God.

Fourthly, because Sherrill sees that man is under the lordship of God, there is a place for "telling" in Christian education. Because both man and animals are God's creation, he does not totally deny conditioned responses and trial and error learning which have come out of scientific experimentats with animals.

Fifthly, because Sherrill sees that the realization of humanity in its fullest sense is man's search for meaning, it is logical for him to emphasize the importance of perception and symbolic communication in teaching and learning.

Thus, it is not improper for us to say that Sherrill's view of teaching methods and learning theory is coherently related to his view of man in God's creation.

### ii. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory As Related to Sin and Man's Original Nature

How is Sherrill's view of teaching methods and learning theory related to his view of sin and man's original nature?

Firstly, from Sherrill's point of view, sin is the breakdown of relationships. In other words, it is the breakdown of two-way communication. Hostility is the seedbed of sin because hostility destroys communication. Wherever there is sin, there is a breakdown of communication. One-way communication tends to deganerate into domination or manipulation. It becomes demonic, when man is treated as an "it" instead of as a "thou." Therefore, the emphasis on two-way communication in Christian education is indispensible for the restoration of relationships with God and with other human beings.

Secondly, in his discussion about "the motive of shrinking back," Sherrill seems to agree with some modern theologians in regarding "shrinking back" as demonic. This negative inward propulsion--the motive of shrinking back--is contrary to participation and involvement. Therefore, Sherrill's emphasis on the learner's participation and invovlement is significant and relevant to the problem of the demonic element in man.

Thirdly, because sin is the breakdown of relationships, Sherrill's emphasis on the ultimacy of the "koinonia" and the divine participation in relationships is significant and relevant to the problem of sin because the restoration of the divine-human relationship implies not only human participation but also divine participation.

Fourthly, because sin is the breakdown of relationships and the change of relationships presupposes the change of perception in the meaning of relationship, Sherrill's emphasis on the principle of learning by insight and depth changes in persons is significant and relevant to the problem of sin. Likewise, his emphasis on the principle of identification is significant and relevant because the effort to identify with others implies one's involvement and participation and eventually leads one to become related to others.

Thus, we can say that Sherrill's view of teaching methods and theory of learning is coherently related to his view of sin and man's original nature.

### iii. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory As Related to Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth

How is Sherrill's view of teaching methods and learning theory related to his view of man's basic needs and human growth?

Firstly, Sherrill's emphasis on the learner's participation and involvement is related to his view that man basically needs to become an individual person and to identify with something greater and stronger than oneself. To become an individual person implies one's self-determination; so also does the act of participation and involvement imply self-determination. It is evident that to identify with others means one's participation and involvement. Furthermore, the emphasis on participation and involvement is helpful to individuation in childhood, psychological weaning from parents in adolescence, and basic identifications in young adulthood. So also is the principle of identification relevant to man's basic needs and human growth.

Secondly, Sherrill's emphases on two-way communication and the "koinonia" in the Christian community are significant and relevant to man's basic needs and human growth. To become an individual person does not mean complete isolation. On the contrary, to be a person means to be in relationship with others. To be a person means to be in communication with others and to belong to a community.

The principle of two-way communication is helpful to the accomplishment of integrating one's acquired philosophy of life and one's spontaneous philosophy of life during the period of middle age. The "koinonia" in the Christian community has special significance for young adults to establish their basic identifications and for old age adults in their spiritual simplification, because the "koinonia" implies the divine participation in the relationships. This does not deny the significance of the "koinonia" for the human growth in other stages.

Thirdly, Sherrill's emphasis on the effectiveness of non-verbal communication is significant in view of the fact that man's basic needs are primarily emotional and interpersonal. This is true in every stage of human growth. Likewise, Sherrill's emphasis on the principle of learning by insight and the changes of depth in persons is significant because man's basic needs are emotional and interpersonal, and the changes of depth in persons are changes in interpersonal relationships and intrapsychic relationships. From this point of view, we can see the significance of sharing experience and the principle of perception; one can improve his interpersonal relationships by sharing experiences with others. The improvement of interpersonal relationships requires changes in perception of the meaning of relationships.

Thus, we can say that Sherrill's view of teaching methods and learning theory is coherently related to his view of man's basic needs and human growth.

### iv. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory As Related to Human Knowledge

How is Sherrill's view of teaching methods and learning theory related to his view of human knowledge?

Firstly, Sherrill does not reject human knowledge. Although he is convinced that we must draw inspiration from "the peculiar genius of the Christian community and of Christian faith rather than from any form of secular society or secular education," he admits our indebtedness to those sources. In fact, he relies heavily on Gestalt psychology, depth psychology and psychiatry in formulating his view of teaching methods and learning theory. His emphasis on the learner's participation and involvement is not particularly from his understanding of God's revelation. His emphases on the principle of learning by insight and on the importance of inter-personal relationships in teaching and learning are by no means uniquely Christian or from "the peculiar genius of the Christian community and of Christian faith. . . ." They are from Gestalt psychology and depth psychology. But they are in harmony with his understanding of the Christian faith. So also is the principle of non-verbal communication. One can say that two-way communication is a reflection of God's revelation and man's response from the theological perspective. At the same time, one can find the emphasis on two-way communication in the so-called secular field.

Secondly, Sherrill sees that one's knowledge about God and his moral knowledge are inevitably colored by his relationships with parents during childhood. He points out that parents, by what they themselves are and do, provide much of the material out of which children make their ideas about God. The earthly father is a prototype of the Heavenly Father. Those who teach children must know their relationships with their parents. The inter-personal relationship is a key to human knowledge about God and moral knowledge, and at the same time a key to teaching and learning in Christian education.

Thirdly, Sherrill also sees the limitation of human knowledge. He sees that there is nothing from the secular source which substitute for God's revelation. What, then does Sherrill draw from "the peculiar genius of the Christian community and of Christian faith?" It is his emphasis on the "koinonia" of the Christian community and the divine participation in human relationships in the "koinonia." "The Spirit of God is present and participant in the interaction between selves within the KOINONIA."[1]

---

[1] Sherrill, The Gift of Power, p. 160.

Thus, we can say that Sherrill's view of teaching methods and learning theory is coherently related to his view of human knowledge.

Briefly, we can summarize our analysis of the relationship between Sherrill's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education by saying that the basic concepts which underlie the two are his concepts of God's revelation and the bi-polar relationships of man. In theory, Sherrill advocates God's revelation to be the foundation for his philosophy of Christian education. But in practice, he starts from the human self in his exposition of his new philosophy of Christian education. There is a distinctive super-natural element in his thought. On the whole, Sherrill's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education are integrally related to each other.

# CHAPTER IX

# A COMPARISON OF ELLIOTT AND SHERRILL

The third step of this dissertation is to compare Elliott and Sherrill; their views of man, their philosophies of Christian education, and the relationship between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education in each person's thought.

## 1. The Nature of Man

In the first part of the comparison of Elliott and Sherrill, we are to find the similarities and the dissimilarities of their views of man, centered on their understandings of man in God's creation, sin and man's original nature, man's basic needs and human growth, and human knowledge.

### i. Man in God's Creation

Both Elliott and Sherrill draw their knowledge about man's nature not only from the Bible, but also from psychology and other branches of social sciences. Their approaches to the nature of man is wholistic in contrast to the Platonic dichotomy in dividing man into two separate entities as soul and body. They both see man as a whole.

Both Elliott and Sherrill stress man's freedom to choose and to make decisions and his autonomy as an individual person, man's responsibility and effort, man's personal relationships with God and man, man's social nature, human worth and potentialities.

But there are dis-similarities in their opinions and their emphases on man's relationship with God, man's uniqueness in the world, and their uses of terminology. Because of the emphasis on God's immanence, Elliott does not stress the difference between God and man. He rather sees the relationship between God and man as the loving father-son relationship which is characterized by freedom and personal communion. He points out the possibility of man's becoming God's partner and the comradeship between God and man. But for Sherrill, it is more appropriate to stress the gulf which exists between God and man; man is a finite creature whereas God is the Infinite Creator; Man is under the lordship and sovereignty of God. God is transcendent.

Both Elliott and Sherrill see the uniqueness of man in the world. Elliott stresses the supreme worth of man and his unlimited potentialities, provided man meets the conditions to release the resources of God. Although Sherrill sees the worth of man and his potentialities, he has never used the adjectives, such as "supreme" or "unlimited" in describing man's worth and potentialities. In addition to man's unique relationship with God, Elliott regards man's nobleness as being expressed through man's rationality, his civilization, and his aesthetic expression, whereas Sherrill finds man's search for meaning to be what makes him a man.

Both Elliott and Sherrill find some kind of analogy between God and man. Elliott uses "Personality" in describing the similarity between God and man, whereas Sherrill prefers the term "self" in describing the similarity between God and man--God, the Self or the Divine Self and man, the self or the human self. The connotation may be different according to how one sees it. But it seems that Elliott implies a social emphasis in his use of "personality," wheras Sherrill's use of "self" has the connotation of individuality.

It should be noted that Elliott stresses God's immanence whereas Sherrill emphasizes God's participation in human relationships. God is present in parental love toward children. God as a "Thou" participates in human "I-thou" relationships.

### ii. Sin and Man's Original Nature

Concerning the problem of sin and man's original nature, both Elliott and Sherrill refer to the Biblical account and psychological discoveries. Both find it neccessary to differentiate the "sick personality" and the "sinner" in the diagnosis of the problem of sin and man's original nature. Both see that there is a place for the legitimate self-assertion in the process of human growth; self-assertion is not necessarily sinful.

Elliott points out that one's interpretation and understanding of sin is greatly influenced by the cultural background; in an authoritarian society, sin is interpreted as rebellion, whereas in a democratic society it is pride, egoism or self-assertion. Furthermore, he sees that society is responsible for the sins committed by its unfortunate members because often the so-called sinners are in fact victims of an evil social order. But Sherrill tends to emphasize the personal responsibility for one's sin and the plight which one's own sins have brought him. Man is even responsible for the sins of forefathers.

Elliott does not see the existence of sin as a general category. He can only see the existence of sins--concrete sinful acts. In contrast, Sherrill approaches the problem of sin from the point of view of relationships; it is the breakdown of relationships--the relationship between God and man, and the relationship between man and man. Hostility is the seed-bed of sin. He sees the irrelevance of the doctrine of original sin, with which Elliott would agree.

Elliott sees man's original nature as neutral and amoral. It is not pre-determined to be good or evil. It is subject to modifications according to life experiences. But Sherrill emphasizes the existence of the demonic element in man. Although he does not use the term "total depravity" in describing man's original nature, he is sure that there is a fundamental problem in man's nature which can not easily be solved by human effort. There is a deeply rooted inner conflict in man. "Man is indeed his own lost continent." Sherrill's view of man's original nature is not optimistic, whereas Elliott's view can be regarded as a guardedly optimistic one.

### iii. Man's Basic Needs and Human Growth

Concerning man's basic needs, Elliott does not give us any clear statement about his view as does Sherrill. But his view of man's basic needs can be derived from the fact that he supports the liberal "religious education" theory of George A. Coe, which is based on the view that man has two natural impulses--egoistic or selfish impulses and unselfish or social impulses. This is very similar to Sherrill's view that man has two basic needs--the need to become an individual person (the selfish or egoistic impulse) and the need to identify with something greater and stronger than oneself (the unselfish or social impulse).

With regard to human growth, both Elliott and Sherrill see the importance of security, love and acceptance for the healthy development of personality.

Elliott divides the total life span into six stages: 1) infancy, 2) childhood, 3) adolescence, 4) early maturity, 5) middle life, and 6) old age. But Sherrill divides it into five stages: 1) childhood, 2) adolescence, 3) young adulthood, 4) middle life, and 5) old age. Elliott does not give much detailed analysis of the problem of life stages as Sherrill does in his The Struggle of the Soul. But they both see the problems of human growth from psychological perspectives. However, Sherrill has a more philosophical concern in his analysis of the central problems of middle life and old age.

Elliott and Sherrill both see the process of human growth as continuing through the life span. They both point out the strong influence of the parents on children's personality patterns, particularly during the formative years. Yet Sherrill sees that the human self is a being and at the same time a becoming. On the whole, Sherrill is less determinative in his point of view about parental influence upon the children's personality development than Elliott. He sees man's becoming and the gift of the power to become.

iv. Human Knowledge

Neither Elliott nor Sherrill are anti-intellectuals. They find a legitimate place for human knowledge in the understanding and the interpretation of the Christian faith and in Christian education.

Elliott permits no clear distinction between the natural and the super-natural, the sacred and the secular, because human knowledge comes through human experience, be it knowledge about God or knowledge about nature. But Sherrill makes a distinction between the sacred and the secular although he acknowledges that we have much to learn from the secular and that human knowledge comes through human experience. Broadly speaking, Elliott's attitude toward human knowledge is integrative, whereas Sherrill's attitude is utilitarian. Conceptually, the importance of human knowledge for Sherrill is subsidiary, though in practice it may not be so.

Both Elliott and Sherrill see the limitations of human knowledge. Elliott points out that science can not be equated with religion, nor become the authority of religion. Scientists limit their work in a special area and they do not create any of the forces or resources of nature upon which they depend. Sherrill also points out that even the latest results of scientific discoveries can not be substituted for the revelation of God. However, religion and science need each other for the benefit of humanity. Yet for him God's revelation is essential.

## 2. Philosophy of Christian Education

Having compared the views of man of Elliott and Sherrill, we are to examine the similarities and dissimilarities in their philosophies of Christian education. The major areas to be compared are those in chapters IV and VI.

### i. Freedom and Authority

Both Elliott and Sherrill have great concern for the issue of freedom and authority in Christian education. Both have dealt with the issue from a historical perspective. Both give similar descriptions about the historical development of the four-fold system of authority--the Bible, creeds, bishops and councils (the constitutional ministry). In defense for the liberal "religious education" against neo-orthodox (or neo-Reformation) theologians, Elliott stresses the right of the private interpretation of the Bible which he regards to be the cardinal principle of the Reformation. Sherrill implies his support for individual liberty in his interpretation of the history of Christian education prior to the Reformation.

Elliott does not accept any particular interpretation of the Christian faith as the source of authority because the church has never been successful in establishing a single authoritative interpretation by way of external control. He sees that the determinative factor in Christian education is not the doctrinal content; it is the individual person whose internal decisions determine the outcome of the educational enterprise, and the educational process is the total sum of the responses made through each person's internal decisions. Therefore, for Elliott authority is in the educational process itself. It resides in personal experiences. Ultimately, he advocates the authority of each individual who participates in the educational process--the private right of each person. Nothing can surpass it; neither doctrine nor the Bible, neither bishops nor church councils. What make one change is ultimately his personal decisions--the exercise of internal authority. The center is persons.

Sherrill does not castigate authoritarian dogmatism as does Elliott. He sees that the ultimate authority is not the Bible itself, neither the church nor the state.

It is beyond the natural order. He regards the lordship of God as one of the eight major themes in the Bible. But Sherrill does not say that Christian education is God-centered. Although he advocates strongly the autonomy and liberty of each individual and opposes any manipulation of the learner by the teacher, he does not say that Christian education is man-centered. Christian education is bipolar; the ultimate authority resides in the meeting between God and man, in God's confronting man and man's response to God.

### ii. Objectives of Christian Education

It is clear that both Elliott and Sherrill do not regard the transmission of Biblical knowledge, or the indoctrination of any particular interpretation of the Christian faith, to be the objectives of Christian education.

For Elliott, the objectives of Christian education are the reinterpretation and enrichment of the Christian faith by individuals and groups for themselves in and through the educational process. It is to educate not only the mind but also the emotions. Its social goal is the cooperative society in which love is genuinely operative; it can be regarded as the realization of God's kingdom on the earth. This social goal is beyond the individual yet takes into account the goals of the individuals and binds them together in love.

For Sherrill, the objectives of Christian education are the changes which take place in persons in their relationships with God, with the church, with other persons, with the physical world, and with oneself. It is the changes which take place in persons through the continuing divine-human encounter in the Christian community in which one finds the "koinonia" and the encounter between human selves. It is the change in depth and not the peripheral change of the self. Therefore, it is not confined to the change of mind either. At this point, Sherrill and Elliott are in agreement. But Sherrill is cautious not to identify any program of social reconstruction with the kingdom of God on earth.

Both Elliott and Sherrill see that the goal of the educational process should not be pre-determined. But they are not in favor of "open-ended" type of education.

### iii. The Content of Christian Education

Both Elliott and Sherrill see the undesirability of having any authoritarian content as the final truth which demands unquestioning acceptance by the learner. They both agree that the major sources for the content of Christian education are the Bible, life situations, and scientific knowledge about the Bible and the world. But their emphases are different.

Elliott regards the Bible as the record of the experiences of the people in the past and the interpretations of their religious experiences; whereas Sherrill regards it as the record of God's revelation to which both the Bible and the church bear witness. Elliott does not give systematic interpretations of his own. Rather, he provides questions related to the Bible for individuals and groups to work out their answers and interpretations. By contrast, Sherrill points out eight themes in the Bible in his discussion about the use of the Bible.

Elliott has a stronger emphasis on the life situations of individuals and groups than does Sherrill. For Elliott, the starting point is always the life situations which provide the problem for solution, by using the Bible as resource material. But for Sherrill, it is the revelation of God. So, there is an emphasis on the "supernatural" in Sherrill's thought which is lacking in Elliott's.

Sherrill has a high regard for the "koinonia" of the Christian community in which the Spirit participates. Elliott also sees the importance of fellowship in the group thinking process. But he sees it rather from the naturalistic point of view.

### iv. Teaching Methods and Learning Theory

With regard to teaching methods, both Elliott and Sherrill stress the learner's participation, involvement, and responsibility. They both see the importance of group process in teaching. But there are differences.

Elliott emphasizes the group thinking process in problem solving, centered on life situations; whereas Sherrill emphasizes the group process in the context of the Christian community which is characterized by the "koinonia."

Elliott's problem solving group process tends to be oriented to verbal communication; whereas Sherrill's emphasis on the "koinonia" tends to be oriented toward the non-verbal.

Theoretically, Elliott is against the Herbartian method. But this does not mean that he denies the validity of the lecture method for Christian education. He includes it in the group thinking process as an integral part. Likewise, Sherrill does not deny the place of "telling" because there is the aspect of man's being confronted by the Truth.

Sherrill emphasizes two-way communication which can be traced to his understanding of God's revelation and man's response. It is not only the communication between man and man, but also between God and man. As for Elliott, the problem solving group process requires also mutual respect, an attempt to understand the point of view of others, and an effort to find an agreeable solution. This implies two-way communication. Sherrill emphasizes the divine participation in the "koinonia" of the Christian community, whereas Elliott describes the creative results of the group thinking process as the release of spiritual power and manifestations of the divine resources around us.

With regard to learning theory, both Elliott and Sherrill have a high regard for Gestalt psychology, and are aware of the importance of physiological factors in human learning; human learning is limited by the physiological factors.

But there are differences between Elliott and Sherrill. Elliott sees that human learning takes place in and through human experience, and that "all knowledge has grown out of man's experience with nature and with human beings." Sherrill is not against Elliott's position at this point, but he expounds the changes in depth with remarkable insight into the inter-personal and intrapsychic relationships and the process of the changes which take place in persons, such as interpenetration and introjection.

With regard to conditioned and responses and trial and error, Walter L. Holcomb[1] who used to work closely with Elliott points out that Elliott stood against conditioning

---

1. Based on what he said in a conversation with the writer.

and trial and error and for insightful learning. Yet one may infer from Elliott's emphasis on the environmental factor--many so-called sinners are really the victims of circumstances beyond their control--that Elliott would allow room for conditioning and responses and trial and error as the way in which persons have learned. Learning by insight is to be prefered, as it leads to greater autonomy. Sherrill is neither in favor of, nor denies totally conditioned responses and trial and error in his evaluation. But he is not in the middle way. He is far more for learning by insight and depth changes in persons.

## 3. The Relationship between One's View of Man and His Philosophy of Christian Education

Finally, we are to examine the similarities and dissimilarities in the relationship between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education in each person's thought. This is to be done in the light of the discussion in chapters VII and VIII.

### i. The Nature of Man in Relation to Freedom and Authority in Christian Education

Both Elliott and Sherrill advocate individual freedom and autonomy in opposition to an authoritarian type of education. They both see the basic (and desirable) nature of authority as internal, rather than external.

In the case of Elliott, this is related to his "personality principle," his emphases on human value and potentialities, his concept of sin as sinful acts, his view of man's basic needs and human growth --the egoistic impulse in man and the individuality in human growth. In Sherrill's case it is related to his interpretation of the "Imago Dei" --man's uniqueness in his relationship with God, his view of man's basic needs--the need to become an individual, and his understanding of the central problems during the first half of the life span--individuation and being weaned psychologically from the parents.

With regard to the determining factor in Christian education, Elliott sees that authority resides in the educational process itself. But Sherrill sees that Christian education is not God-centered, nor man-centered; it is centered on the meeting between God and man. How do they relate this to their views of man?

Elliott's process-centered view of authority can be related to the supremacy of man--man's being a co-worker with God, and man's original nature being neutral and amoral--being in an undivided peaceful state. By contrast Sherrill's bi-polar, relationship-centered (the meeting between God and man) authority can be related to his view of man's uniqueness in his relationship with God and his view of man's original nature being in basic conflict. However, an exact comparison between Elliott and Sherrill in this regard is unlikely to be found nor to be desired by anyone.

This is due the fact that they do not see things from the same perspective.

Both Elliott and Sherrill have a positive attitude toward human knowledge. How do they relate it to their views of freedom and authority? The difference between Elliott's attitude toward human knowledge and the Sherrill's is parallel to the difference between man-centered, process-centered, mono-polar authority and relationship-centered bi-polar authority--the difference between Elliott's view of freedom and authority and the Sherrill's. The fact that Elliott permits no distinction between the secular and the sacred but Sherrill does, reflects the difference in their views of God, which affect in turn their views of man and authority. Elliott's positive attitude toward human knowledge is related to his man-centered, process-centered, mono-polar authority and God's immanence; whereas Sherrill's relationship-centered, bi-polar authority and God's transcendence and immanence are related to his positive attidue toward human knowledge.

### ii. The Nature of Man in Relation to the Objectives of Christian Education

Both Elliott and Sherrill do not follow the traditional view in regarding the transmission of the Biblical knowledge or the indoctrination of any denominational confession of faith as the objectives of Christian education. Elliott points out that the objectives of Christian education are the reinterpretation and enrichment of the Christian faith by individuals and groups in and through the educational process, and the establishment of a co-operative society in which love is genuinely operative; whereas Sherrill states that the purpose of Christian education is to guide the changes which take place in persons in their relationships with God, with the church, with other persons, with the physical world, and with oneself. How do they relate this to their views of man?

The similarity between Elliott and Sherrill is that they both can relate their objectives of Christian education to their views of man as a self-determining person, man as a social being, and their views of man's basic needs and human growth. They can also relate their objectives of Christian education to their concepts of sin and man's original nature, and slightly to their views of human knowledge. But there are differences between them.

Elliott derives his view of man as a self-determining person from his "personality principle"; whereas Sherrill derives it from a symbolic representation--man being created in the image of God. Furthermore, Elliott's objectives of Christian education fits well with his emphasis on cultural background in the interpretation of sin and individuality in man's original equipment and human growth; whereas Sherrill's objectives of Christian education are suited to his interpretation of sin as the breakdown of relationships and his emphasis on man's inner conflict. Elliott's objectives of Christian education are related to human knowledge from both cognitive and affective points of view; whereas Sherrill's objectives of Christian education are related to human knowledge mainly from the affective point of view.

### iii. The Nature of Man in Relation to the Content of Christian Education

Both Elliott and Sherrill regard the Bible as one of the major resources for the content of Christian education, but they differ in the ways that they relate the Bible to their views of man. Elliott maintains that man can not dissociate his present experience "from the traditions of historic experience without distortion," because man can not live in a vacuum. This historic continuity and solidarity of man can be rooted in man's social nature and the characteristics of human personality. Sherrill holds that the Bible bears witness to God's revelation, which presupposes man's unique relationship with God, and Sherrill derives man's uniqueness in his relationship with God from the symbolic representation--the image of God.

Both Elliott and Sherrill point out that the content of Christian education should not be pre-fixed or predetermined. This is related to their emphases on the dynamic nature of man as a person, the uniqueness of each person's growing process, and the cultural influence upon man.

Both Elliott and Sherrill see the importance of scientific knowledge about the Bible and the world in their discussions of the content of Christian education. This is related to their positive attitudes toward human knowledge.

Elliott particularly emphasizes the life situations of the individuals and groups which one must first take into account in determining educational content. This is related to his regard for human value, his interpretation of sin, his understanding of the dynamic nature of human growth, and his experience-centered view of human knowledge. In contrast, Sherrill emphasizes the Christian community which is characterized by the "koinonia," because the Christian community bears witness to God's revelation. This is related to his view of man as a unique creature of God, his concept of sin as the breakdown of relationships, his view of man's basic needs and the dynamic nature of human growth. This is based on his relationship-oriented thinking.

### iv. The Nature of Man in Relation to Teaching Methods and Learning Theory

Both Elliott and Sherrill have coherently integrated their views of man and their teaching methods and learning theories.

Elliott's group thinking process and his life situation approach are related to his view of man as a person with freedom, individuality and social nature. One can say that Elliott's group thinking process and his life situation approach are means by which his "personality principle" is realized. Likewise, Sherrill's emphases on the learner's participation and involvement, principles of two-way communication and non-verbal communication, and the principle of identification are related to his view of man as a unique creature of God. His emphasis on the divine participation in the "koinonia" is related to his understanding of the nature of God-man relationship. One can say that Sherrill's major principles of teaching methods are ways by which his view of man can be realized.

Elliott's group thinking process and his life situation approach are not contradictory to his interpretation of sin and man's original nature. Rather they are means by which the problems of sin can be solved, man's basic needs can be met, and human growth can be facilitated. This is also true of Sherrill's teaching methods, except the differences in the way their basic concepts are related to their teaching methods and their views of sin, man's original nature and basic needs, and human growth--Elliott's experience and personality centered thinking versus Sherrill's relationship centered thinking.

Elliott's theory of learning is centered on human experience; man learns in and through human experience. Sherrill's theory is centered on interpersonal relationships and intrapsychic relationships in and through which changes in depth take place.

Basic to Elliott's teaching methods and learning theory and his view of man is his "personality principle" on which he builds his ideas of the problem solving, life situations centered group thinking process and experience centered theory of learning, and his view of man as a person and human growth. Whereas, basic to Sherrill's view of man and his teaching methods and learning theory is his concept of "relationships" which signify man's uniqueness, the predisposition for sin, human growth, two-way communication and the divine participation in the "koinonia."

Thus we find that there is a supernatural element in the relationship between Sherrill's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education--the divine-human relationship based on a concept of God as both immanent and transcendent; whereas the relationship between Elliott's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education is anthropocentric with a concept of God as only immanent, at least as far as man's knowing is concerned.

# CHAPTER X

# FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

## 1. Findings

In the first step of our research, we have investigated the writings of Elliott and Sherrill in order to determine their views of man and their philosophies of Christian education. The findings can be summarized as follows:

1. Elliott sees that man is a personality in relation to God who is the "Universe Personality"; man is of supreme worth and with almost unlimited potentialities, and is capable of rational, aesthetic expression and civilization. He interprets sin in terms of sinful acts and differentiates between sin and the sick personality. He regards man's original nature as being amoral and neutral and man's basic needs as being the "egoistic" and the social impulses. He finds that human growth is a continous process beginning with complete dependence on others in infancy and ending with a sense of completion in old age, and that healthy personality development requires security, success or achievement, and a warm social environment. He emphasizes that human knowledge comes from human experience, be it knowledge

about God or nature.

2. Elliott gives support to the progressive type of education in opposition to the authoritarian and transmissive types of education. He emphasizes individual freedom, the private right to interpret the Bible, and the educational process itself being where the authority resides. He regards the objectives of Christian education to be the reinterpretation and enrichment of the Christian faith by the individuals and groups for themselves in and through the educational process and the realization of a co-operative society in which love is genuinely operative. He would use as resources the Bible, the testimonies of teachers, and scientific knowledge about the Bible and the world. He emphasizes the group thinking process and life situation centered approach, since human learning takes place in and through experience.

3. Sherrill sees that man is a creature of God, but a unique creature, being created in the image of God; man is a self-determinative creature but is under the lordship of God; man is both individual and social; man is in search of meaning. He interprets sin as the breakdown of relationships between God and man, and between man and man; hostility is the seed-bed of sin; he also differentiates sin from the sick personality. He sees the existence of the "demonic element" and the basic conflict in man's nature.

He sees man's basic needs to be the need to identify with something greater and stronger than oneself and the need to become an individual person. He finds that human growth is a continuous process beginning with individuation in childhood and ending with "simplification" of life in old age. For Sherrill, the human self is a being and a becoming. He emphasizes the parental influence on the child's knowledge of God through parental-child relationships. He also emphasizes the work of the Spirit.

4. Sherrill advocates individual freedom and autonomy in opposition to the authoritarian and transmissive types of education and the degeneration of education through manipulation. He points out that Christian education is not God-centered, nor is it man-centered; it is bi-polar. It is concerned about the meeting between God and man; God confronting man and man's encounter with God. He regards the objectives of Christian education to be the changes which take place in persons in their relationships with God, with the church, with other persons, with the physical world and with oneself, through the use of the Bible, scientific knowledge about the Bible and the world, in the context of the "koinonia" of the Christian community in which there is the divine participation of the Spirit. He emphasizes two-way communication and the principle of non-verbal communication because man learns in and through relationships in human interaction and the

perception of new meanings.

In the second step of our research, we have analyzed the relationships between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education in the thought of Elliott and Sherrill. The findings can be summarized as follows:

1. Elliott's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education are coherently related to each other. His emphasis on the internal authority which resides in the educational process itself is related to his "personality principle," his high regard for human worth and potentialities, and his emphasis on the diversified nature of man's original equipment and human growth. His educational objectives and teaching methods are geared to his understanding of man's original nature, the problem of sin, man's basic needs and the personality development. His theory of learning and his concept of human knowledge are in harmony with each other.

2. Sherrill's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education are coherently related to each other. His emphasis on individual autonomy and freedom is related to his view of man in God's creation. His educational objectives and teaching methods are appropriate to his interpretation of sin, man's basic needs, the existence of the "demonic element" in man, and his understanding of human growth. His concept of human knowledge about God and his

theory of learning are also consistent with each other.

In the third step of our research, we have compared Elliott and Sherrill. The findings can be summarized as follows:

1. Both Elliott and Sherrill have a wholistic view of man and advocate man's freedom and autonomy. Both see that man is individual and social. Elliott emphasizes man's partnership with God, whereas Sherrill sees the gulf between the creature and the Creator, the finite and the Infinite. Elliott regards man's original nature as being a-moral and neutral, whereas Sherrill sees the existence of the humanly uneradicable "demonic element" in man. Both have similar understandings of human growth and human knowledge with slight differences in emphasis. Fundamentally, Elliott's view of man is naturalistic, whereas Sherrill's view of man is both naturalistic and super-naturalistic.

2. Both Elliott and Sherrill advocate man's autonomy in education and repudiate the authoritarian and transmissive types of education. But Elliott's view of process centered authority is anthropocentric because his epistemology is anthropocentric, whereas Sherrill stresses the authority which is beyond the boundary of the natural order as well as man's self determination because his epistemology is theo-anthropocentric. Elliott's objectives of Christian education are centered on man, both individuals and groups,

whereas Sherrill sees them to be changes of relationships which reflect his view of man's various dimensions of being. With regard to the content of Christian education and teaching methods, Elliott is also anthropocentric and naturalistic, whereas Sherrill is both theo-anthropocentric, and naturalistic-supernaturalistic.

3. With regard to the relationship between one's view of man and his philosophy of Christian education, we have found that Elliott relates his emphasis on individual freedom and autonomy in education to his "personality principle," whereas Sherrill relates it to his understanding of man's being a self-determinative creature. Likewise, Elliott's process-centered view of authority and Sherrill's bi-polar, relationship-centered view of authority are related to their views of man, which are in turn coherently related to their concepts of God. Both Elliott's and Sherrill's views of the objectives of Christian education are coherently related to their understanding of sin, man's original nature and basic needs, and human growth processes. So also are their views of the content of Christian education, teaching methods and learning theories.

## 2. Conclusions

Although the dissertation deals with the problem of determining the basic principles which are inherent in the relationship between the view of man and the philosophy of Christian education in the thought of Elliott and Sherrill, it deals with other important theological concepts, such as, the concept of God, the Bible, revelation, and the church because one's view of man is inseparably related to other theological concepts in his thought system. Out of our research, the following conclusions are drawn.

Firstly, in the thought system of one who coherently and integrally relates his view of man and his philosophy of Christian education, there is a core around which he spins his intellectual web, regardless of whether the core is mono-polar or bi-polar, mono-focal or bi-focal.

Secondly, the dynamic view of man leads to relativistic and pluralistic thinking which makes one repudiate absolutism in any form of authoritarian and transmissive education. Thus, it is impossible to have a universally accepted philosophy of Christian education.

Thirdly, a naturalistic view of man leads to a naturalistic philosophy of Christian education. Likewise, a naturalistic-supernaturalistic view of man leads to a naturalistic-supernaturalistic philosophy of Christian education.

Fourthly, in theory one may be naturalistic or naturalistic-supernaturalistic in his view of man and his philosophy of Christian education, but in practice one tends to be anthropocentric beginning from life situations, the human predicament and ending with the satisfaction of man's needs.

## 3. Implications

Out of this study, we can draw five major implications for the educational ministry of the church in general and for the formulation of an adequate philosophy of Christian education in particular.

Firstly, it is imperative for those who want to integrate their views of man and their philosophies of Christian education to clarify their thinking and determine the core of their thought systems, and then select a key concept which plays the primary role in relating the two, and around which a coherent thought system is to be built.

Secondly, for the philosophy of Christian education which is adequate, appropriate and relevant in a highly pluralistic and dynamic society, such as the American society, a dynamic view of man is needed.

Thirdly, a dynamic view of man would lead the church not to prescribe or even enforce any particular philosophy of Christian education to be accepted unquestionably by all of its members. One whose view of man is a dynamic one would not expect others to prescribe a philosophy of Christian education for him or her in particular.

Fourthly, since a naturalistic view of man leads to a naturalistic philosophy of Christian education, and a naturalistic-supernaturalistic view of man leads to a naturalistic-supernaturalistic philosophy of Christian education, any change in the theological view of man needs to be taken into serious considerations by Christian educators.

Fifthly, for those who try to narrow down the gap between the naturalistic position and the naturalistic-supernaturalistic position, the study of man is highly important because one tends to be anthropocentric in practice even though he claims to be theo-anthropocentric in theory.

Since this study is about the thought of only two leaders in the field of Christian education, a further study of similar kind would be desirable in order to determine whether or not the conclusions and implications of this dissertation are verified by more extensive research.

# APPENDIX I

## Mrs. Lewis J. Sherrill's Letter I
(May 9, 1968)

Dear Mr. Kao:

Your letter of May third was forwarded to me and arrived yesterday. I am afraid I can not be of much help to you in your search. There have been a number of people writing me for material to be used in a Ph.D. dissertation, some who have completed it. Others have never let me know whether they had or not, and I do not remember the exact titles of what they proposed to write.

I believe Dr. Frank Herriott (?) was planning to write something along that line--not for a Ph.D. dissertation of course. I do not know whether he did or not. He is in the Peace Corps in Africa now.

The only original manuscripts that I know about are in the library of the Presbyterian School of Christian Education or the Seminary library, both in Richmond, Virginia.

I hope you are enjoying your work at B.U. and will be able to find the kind of material you need for your dissertation.

Sincerely yours,

Helen H. Sherrill
(Mrs. Lewis J. Sherrill)

## APPENDIX II

### Mrs. Lewis J. Sherrill's Letter II
(Jan. 7, 1969)

Dear Mr. Kao:

It must make you very happy to have your dissertation nearing completion. I wish I could be of some real help to you in answering your questions. I do not recall any one scholar who stood out above all others in influencing his (Lewis J. Sherrill) thinking. He greatly admired Dean Weigle of Yale Divinity School when he received his Ph. D. there, also Dr. Van Dusen of Union. He also admired both Reinhold and Richard Niebuhr and Tillich. From the psychological angle I think he felt closer to Jung's and Rank's writing, also Erikson.

I am answering your letter in a great hurry as I am trying to get things in order here at home before I leave for Texas where there is illness in the family.

I wish you great success in your orals.

Sincerely,

Helen Sherrill

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## 1. Primary Source of Elliott
(chronological order)

### i. Single Author

Elliott, Harrison S. "The Student Conference." *Association Men*, (August, 1911), p. 510.

________, "The Bible Study Institute." *North American Student*, (October, 1911), pp. 9-11.

________, "An Opportunity for Constructive Criticism." *Intercollegian*, Vol. XXIV (April, 1912), pp. 172-173.

________, "A Survey of Conditions in State Universities." *Religious Education*, Vol. VIII, (August, 1913), pp. 255-256.

________, "A Suggested Curriculum for Voluntary Christian Education Groups in Colleges and Universities." *Religious Education*, Vol. VIII, (December, 1913), pp. 463-469.

________, "Winning the College for Voluntary Study." *North American Student*, Vol. III (February, 1915), pp. 195-197.

________, *Report of Progress, Commission on Bible Study and Other Christian Education Books*. New York: Association Press, 1916.

________, *How to Ensure the Best Leadership of the Bible Study Work*. New York: Association Press, 1916.

________, "Voluntary Study Book News." *North American Student*, Vol. VI (October, 1917), pp. 32-34.

Elliott, Harrison S. *A New World of Democracy*. New York: Association Press, 1918.

________, *Training an Adequate Leadership for Voluntary Study Groups*. New York: Association Press, 1918.

________, *Building a New World*. New York: Association Press, 1918.

________, *First Aid on Bible Discussion Groups*. New York: Association Press, 1919.

________, "Distinctive Features in the 1919 Student Summer Conference." *Intercollegian*, (October, 1919), pp. 6-8.

________, "Coaching Student Leaders." *Intercollegian*, (November, 1919), pp. 2-3.

________, "Morning Watch for Mission Study Class Members." *Intercollegian*, (February, 1920), pp. 20-21.

________, "A Survey of Bible Study in the United States." A report to the World Christian Federation, April, 1920. *

________, "Discussion Syllabus"--Prepared for Cleveland Conference. *Religious Education*, Vol. XVIII (June, 1923), pp. 187-195.

________, "The People's Part in Leadership." *The World Tomorrow*, Vol. VI (August, 1923), pp. 235-237.

________, *How Jesus Met Life Questions*. New York: Association Press, 1924.

________, "The Relation of Discussion to Worship." *Religious Education*, Vol. XX (October, 1925), pp. 352-354.

________, "The Significance of Process in the Progress of Christianity." *Alumni Bulletin of the Union Theological Seminary*, (October, 1925), pp. 7-18. (Inaugural address).

________, *Program Suggestions for Christian Citizenship*. New York: Association Press, 1926.

Elliott, Harrison S. The Why and How of Group Discussion. New York: Association Press, 1926.

________, Methods for Group Leaders to Guide Development of Christian Citizenship in Boys' Groups. New York: Association Press, 1926.

________, "Larger Dividens for Students through Improved Study Methods." Intercollegian, Vol. XLIII (March, 1926), pp. 161-162.

________, "The Main Business of a Student." Intercollegian, Vol. XLIII (April, 1926), pp. 198-199.

________, "The Findings of Modern Psychology and the Potentialities of Human Life." Religion on Campus. (National Student Conference, Milwaukee, 1926), 1927, pp. 143-160.

________, "The Progress of Thinking in the Convention." Religious Education, Vol. XXIII (April, 1928), pp. 346-356.

________, "The Problem of Correlation." International Journal of Religious Education, Vol. IV (May, 1928), p. 9.

________, "Confessions of Faith in Religious Education Association." Religious Education, Vol. XXIII (September, 1928), p. 611.

________, The Process of Group Thinking. New York: Association Press, 1928.

________, "A Program for Piety." The Journal of Religion, Vol. X (January, 1930), pp. 145-149.

________, "The Challenge of Psychology to Christianity." The Student World, Vol. XXIII (January, 1930), pp. 55-59.

________, "Shifting Psychologies in Their Bearing on Social Change." Religious Education, Vol. XXV (June, 1930), pp. 555-559.

________, Group Discussion in Religious Education. New York: Association Press, 1930.

________, "How Optimistic Can an Educator Be?" A paper read at Union Seminary faculty meeting, February, 1933. *

Elliott, Harrison S. "Suggestions on Program." *Religious Education*, Vol. XXX (July, 1935), pp. 4-6.

________, "The Next Convention of the Religious Education Association." *Religious Education*, Vol. XXX (October, 1935), pp. 84-86.

________, *Solving Personal Problems: A Counseling Manual.* New York: H. Holt and Co., 1936.

________, "How the Commission Proceeded." *National Assembly of Student Christian Associations, Oxford, Ohio, 1937/38*, 1938, pp. 101-109.

________, "Group Work As an Instrument for Democracy." *Christian Citizenship*, Vol. XVII (November, 1938), p. 577.

________, "Are Weekday Church Schools the Solution?" *International Journal of Religious Education*, Vol. XVII (November, 1940), pp. 8-9, 11, 40.

________, "The Educational Issue." A speech made at the Parent-Teacher Association of the Lincoln School, 1940, pp. 7.*

________, "Present Conflicts in Protestant Religious Education." Ph. D. dissertation, New Haven: Yale University, 1940, (Published under the title, Can Religious Education Be Christian?).

________, *Can Religious Education Be Christian?* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1940.

________, "The Implication of a Functional Approach." *The Journal of Bible and Religion*, Vol. X (February, 1942), pp. 22-32.

________, *Suggested Syllabus on Religion in Higher Education.* Chicago: Religious Education Association, 1942.

________, *Youth and War*. New York: Association Press, 1942.

________, "Education in the Church." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, Vol. IV (March, 1943), pp. 8-10, 17.

Elliott, Harrison S. "A Survey of Recent Literature--Religious Education." Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. VII (March, 1946).

________, "Theological-Educational Issues in Christian Education." Chicago, International Council of Religious Education, August, 1945, pp. 9. (mimeographed).

________, "The Report on Theological and Educational Foundations: A Critique of the Reprot." International Journal of Religious Education, Vol. XXIV (April, 1948), p. 13.

________, "Major Issues in the Proposals to Make Agencies of Public Education Responsible for Teaching Religion." Religious Education, Vol. XLIII (July-August, 1948), pp. 198-200.

________, "The Seminary as a Christian Community." Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. V (March, 1950), pp. 10-15.

________, "Reflections of a Religious Educator." Religious Education, Vol XLV (July-August, 1950), pp. 195-202.

________, "Religion and the Democratic Society of the Future." Religious Education, Vol XLV (September-October, 1950), pp. 283-286.

________, "Individual and Group Counseling." Orientation in Religious Education, ed. by Philip Henry Lotz, New York: Abingdon Press, 1950, pp. 183-196.

ii. Combined Authors

Elliott, Harrison S. and Cutler, Ethel. Student Standards of Action. New York: Association Press, 1914.

Elliott, Harrison S. and Curry, A. Bruce. New Testament Ideals for Present World Task. New York: Association Press, 1919.

Elliott, Harrison S. and Gregg, Abel J. Trends in Boys' Work of the Y.M.C.A. New York: Association Press, 1926.

Elliott, Harrison S. and Gregg, Abel J. *Eight Ways of Organizing Activity Programs.* New York: Association Press, 1926.

Elliott, Harrison S. *et al.* *What Is Y.M.C.A.?* New York: Association Press, 1936.

Elliott, Harrison S. *et al.* *Unemployment--A Discussion Outline*. New York: Association Press, 1930.

Elliott, Harrison S. *et al.* *The Y.M.C.A. of the Future*. New York: Association Press, 1940.

2. Primary Source of Sherrill
(chronological order)

i. Single Author

Sherrill, Lewis J. "Parochial Schools in the Old School Presbyterian Church, 1846-1870." Published Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1929.

________, *Presbyterian Parochial Schools, 1846-1870* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932.

________, *Religious Education in the Small Church*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1932.

________, *Family and Church*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1937.

________, *Understanding Children*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1939.

________, *The Opening Doors of Childhood.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944.

________, *Becoming a Christian*. Richmond, Va.: Knox Press, 1943.

________, *The Rise of Christian Education*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944.

________, *Lift up Your Eyes*. Richmond, Va.: Knox Press, 1949.

________, "A Historical Study of the Religious Education Movement." *Orientation in Religious*

Education, ed. by P. H. Lotz, New York: Abingdon Press, 1950, pp. 20-24.

Sherrill, Lewis J. "Theological Foundation of Christian Education." Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Special Issue, (Januarly, 1951), pp. 3-12.

________, "Harrison Sacket Elliott." Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. VII (November, 1951), pp. 30-31.

________, The Struggle of the Soul. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951.

________, "Response to Edith Hunter's Article--Woe unto Us Who Are Biblically Literate." Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. VIII (January, 1953), pp. 16-18.

________, "Survey of Recent Theological Literature; Religious Education and Pastoral Care." Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. IX (March, 1954), pp. 23-25.

________, The Gift of Power. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1955.

________. "Deeper Changes in the Self." Pastoral Psychology, Vol. VII (June, 1956).

________, "My Times." Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. XII (January, 1957), pp. 3-7.

________, Guilt and Redemption. Richmond, Va.: Knox Press, (1945, first edition), Revised Edition, 1957.

________, "Revelation and Christian Nurture." Encyclopedia for Church Group Leaders, ed. by Lee J. Gable, New York: Association Press, 1959, pp. 185-187.

ii. Combined Authors

Sherrill, Lewis J. and Purcell, John Edwin. Adult Education in the Church. Richmond, Va.:

Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1936.

Sherrill, Lewis J. and Sherrill, Helen. "Bring Christ to His Own Birthday." *International Journal of Religious Education*, Vol. XV, (December, 1937), p. 7.

________, "Interpreting Death to Children." *International Journal of Religious Education*, Vol. XXVIII, (May, 1952), pp. 4-6.

### 3. Secondary Sources of Elliott and Sherrill (alphabetical order)

#### i. Secondary Source of Elliott

Almon, David Kyle. "Personalism in Religious Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1944.

Chave, Ernest J. "In Memorium--Thought Contributions of Harrison Elliott." *Religious Education*, Vol. XLVI, (September-October, 1951), pp. 262-263.

Chipkin, Israel S. "In Memorium--Harrison Sacket Elliott As an Interfaith Worker." *Religious Education*, Vol. XLVI, (September-October, 1951), p. 261.

Coe, George A. "In Memorium--Harrison Sacket Elliott--On Life, Work and Influence." *Religious Education*, Vol. XLVI, (September-October, 1951), p. 264.

Coffin, Henry Sloane. "In Memorium--Harrison Sacket Elliott--Memorial Prayer." *Religious Education*, Vol. XLVI, (September-October, 1951), p. 268.

Franklin, Samuel P. "In Memorium--Harrison Sacket Elliott in the Religious Education Association." *Religious Education*, Vol. XLVI, (September-October, 1951), p. 259.

Hall, Lawrence K. "Harrison S. Elliott, A Sketch of His Y.M.C.A. Work." 1960, a typescript.**

Harper, F. Nile. "The Thought and Work of Harrison S. Elliott." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1964.

Harris, Frederick M. "Harrison Sacket Elliott." A four page typscript.**

Hartshorne, Hugh. "In Memorium--Harrison Sacket Elliott As a Religious Educator." Religious Education, Vol. VLVI, (September-October, 1951), p. 265.

Jewell, David William. "Aspects of Authority in Christian Education in Historical Perspective." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1958.

Johnson, F. Ernest. "In Memorium--Harrison Sacket Elliott As a Colleague." Religious Education, Vol. XLVI, (September-October, 1951), p. 260.

Jones, Major J. "The Place of God in the Educative Process according to George A. Coe, William C. Bower, and Harrison S. Elliott." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Boston University School of Theology, 1957.

Limbert, Paul. "In Memorium--Harrison Sacket Elliott --Resolution Adopted by the Association Press Committee." Religious Education, Vol. XLVI, (September-October, 1951), p. 267.

Moore, William Clifton. "Christian Education in the Light of Three Theological Views of Man." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1954.

Sockman, Ralph W. "In Memorium--Harrison Sacket Elliott As a Churchman." Religious Education, Vol. XLVI, (September-October, 1951), p. 266.

Steward, David S. "Patterns of Conversation: An Interpretation of the Recent Work of Christian Education Theorists." Religious Education, Vol. LXIII, (July-August, 1968), pp. 258-269.

Young, Charles William. "Theological Implications of Progressive Religious Education As Based on the Theology of the Evangelical United Brethren Church and the Views of Harrison Sacket Elliott and William Clayton Bower. . . " Unpublished S.T.M. Thesis, Union Theological Seminary, 1951.

ii. Secondary Source of Sherrill

Allan, D. Maurice. "Review of *Guilt and Redemption* by Lewis J. Sherrill." *Interpretation*, Vol. XII, (July, 1958), p. 375.

Benfield, William A. "Dr. Sherrill As a Preacher." *A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill*, Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, 1957, unpaged.

Caldwell, Frank H. "An Appreciation of a Friend." An Eulogy at the Funeral Service, *A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill*, Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, 1957, unpaged.

Cunningham, John R. "Dr. Sherrill As a Friend." *A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill*, Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, 1957, unpaged.

Fairchild, Roy W. "The Contribution of Lewis J. Sherrill to Christian Education." *Religious Education*, Vol. LIII, (1958), pp. 403-411.

Homerighausen, E.G. "Review of *The Struggle of the Soul* by Lewis J. Sherrill." *The Pastor*, Vol. XIV, (July, 1951), p. 30.

________, "Review of *The Gift of Power* by Lewis J. Sherrill." *The Christian Century*, Vol. 73, (January 4, 1956), p. 14.

Horner, Norman A. "Dr. Sherrill As a Teacher." *A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill*, Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, 1957, unpaged.

Little, Sara. *The Role of the Bible in Contemporary Christian Education*. Richmond, Va.: Knox Press, 1961.

Love, Julian Price. "Dr. Sherrill's Philosophy of Life." *A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill*, Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, 1957, unpaged.

Lynn, Robert W. "The Religious Educators: Their Vision of Polity and Education." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, Vol. XXI, (January, 1966), pp. 145-159.

Maynard, Donald M. "Review of *The Struggle of the Soul* by Lewis J. Sherrill." *The Pastor*, Vol. XIV, (July, 1951), p. 30.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. "In Memoriam--Lewis Joseph Sherrill." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, Vol. XII, (March, 1957), pp. 78-80.

Nyberg, Walter Lawrence. "A Comparative Study of Key Concepts in the Theories of Religious Education Advocated by George Albert Coe and Lewis J. Sherrill." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1966.

Roberts, Walter N. "Dr. Sherrill As a Leader in Theological Education." *A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill*, Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, 1957, unpaged.

Schreyer, George M. *Christian Education in Theological Focus*. Philadelphia, Pa.: The Christian Education Press, 1962.

Van Dusen, Henry P. "A Review of *The Gift of Power* by Lewis J. Sherrill." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, Vol. XI, (May, 1956), p. 59.

Weigle, Luther A. "Dr. Sherrill As a Student." *A Volume of Memorials: Lewis Joseph Sherrill*, Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, 1957, unpaged.

## 4. Other Sources

Cooperative Curriculum Project. The Church's Educational Ministry: a Curriculum Plan, St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1965.

Dewey, John. Philosophy of Education. Totowa, N.J.: A Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1966, (Originally published as Problems of Men and copyrighted in 1946 by the Philosophical Library, Inc.).

Doctoral Dissertation Abstracts, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1938-1967.

Kaufman, Gordon D. "Christian Education in Theological Focus." Religious Education, Vol. LX, (January-February, 1965), pp. 15-20.

Little, Lawrence C. Foundations for a Philosophy of Christian Education. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

McCook, Charles F. "The Self Constructs in the Writings of Selected Psychologists and Religious Education Theorists." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1964.

Methodist Church, General Board of Education, the Curriculum Committee. Design for Methodist Curriculum. Graded Press, 1965.

Reitz, Donald Beeler. "Implications of the Doctrine of Man for Christian Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1955.

Vieth, Paul H. "Religious Education Faces the Future." Religious Education, Vol. LIX, (May-June, 1964), p. 209.

* Typscripts kept by Mrs. Harrison S. Elliott.

** Typscripts kept by the Y.M.C.A. Historical Library.

# VITA

On February 29, 1932 Charles Chiau-Liong Kao was born to Sin-Tek Kao and his wife, Sui Chan, as their first child at Tiong-lo-na, Kaoshiung, Taiwan, China. He had a Japanese education in his childhood and Chinese education in his adolescence. After high school, he entered Tainan Theological College in 1951 and graduated, Summa Cum Laude, in 1955. In his senior year, he served as President of the Students' Council.

Having had a pastorate at Eastgate Church in Tainan for two years, he was called to be the Librarian and Instructor by Tainan Theological College and was sent to England for further study in 1959 (St. Andrew's College, Selly Oak and Westminster College, Cambridge) and then to the United States in 1961. He received the S.T.M. degree and Certificate of the Program of Advanced Religious Studies from Union Theological Seminary, New York, in May, 1962. After a year's study at Boston University School of Theology, he returned to Tainan Theological College in August, 1963 and served as the Assistant Professor of Christian Education for three years and then as an Associate Professor. He came to Boston University again in September, 1967 as a doctoral candidate majoring in Christian education.

He married Siu-Ki Song in May, 1956 and has a talented son, Khian-Sin Kao, who was born in September, 1957.